

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 5007. A bill for the relief of Gerzon Gruszka, Stella Gruszka and Tamara Gruszka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Maj. Don B. Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 5009. A bill for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co., George B. Henly, sole owner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

368. By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Petition of Mrs. Edna Breeden and 440 others regarding alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of board of commissioners, city of Newark, N. J., requesting the Congress of the United States to revise the treaty of peace with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

370. Also, petition of Iowa State Federation of Labor, Des Moines, Iowa, relative to calling upon the Congress to implement the anti-inflation program of the administration, which has been endorsed by the American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 31, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John Nelson Taylor, St. Mark's Church, Fort Dodge, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, Supreme Ruler of Nations, without whom no people can be great: We thank Thee for the progress and prosperity vouchsafed to this Nation, and for the countless blessings, temporal and spiritual, bestowed upon its people. Make us, we beseech Thee, more sensible of Thy goodness, and our responsibility as stewards of Thy gifts. And grant us such virtue and true religion that by our deliberations, our legislation, and by our lives Thy holy name may be forever glorified and the welfare of Thy people advanced. Endue with wisdom, patience, understanding, counsel, and strength our Representatives here assembled, and all who are engaged in the Government of this Nation; that upholding what is right and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine purpose. Grant them strength so to serve Thee that the heritage received from our fathers may be preserved in our

time, and handed down unimpaired to our children; and grant that from generation to generation we may remain a united people loyal to the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUSING RELIEF IN THE MISSOURI-KANSAS-OKLAHOMA FLOOD DISASTER EMERGENCY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to provide housing relief in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood disaster emergency.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 8 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "And provided further" in the last proviso thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Provided further" and by inserting at the end of said last proviso a colon and the following: "And provided further, That, where the mortgagor is the owner and occupant of the property and establishes (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner) that his home, which he occupied as an owner or as a tenant, was destroyed as a result of a flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm or other catastrophe, which the President pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes' (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950), has determined to be a major disaster, such maximum dollar limitations may be increased by the Commissioner from \$4,750 to \$7,000, and from \$5,600 to \$8,000, respectively, and the percentage limitation may be increased by the Commissioner from 95 percent to 100 percent of the appraised value."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes" (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950), is amended by inserting in clause (d) of the first sentence thereof after the words "in such major disaster" the following: "providing temporary housing or other emergency shelter for families who, as a result of such major disaster, require temporary housing or other emergency shelter."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to provide certain immediate relief to affected individuals in the disaster areas of Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma with respect to temporary housing and other emergency shelter. The director of relief activities in that area, Mr. Foley, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, finds that in order to provide even temporary and emergency shelter for a number of people whose homes have been completely or almost entirely destroyed by the flood, he must have this additional authority.

In addition, the resolution provides for the liberalization of the mortgage-in-

surance provisions of section 8 of the National Housing Act. It raises the percentage amount of the mortgages which may be insured from 95 percent to 100 percent for those building low-cost homes to replace houses which have been destroyed by floods or reconstructing homes which have been so extensively damaged as to require reconstruction. The money is already available under the Disaster Relief Act for providing temporary housing or other emergency shelter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It affects only the disaster area?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes, sir. I might say it was reported without objection this morning by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How long does the authority extend?

Mr. BOLLING. It runs to the National Housing Act. It applies specifically to the disaster area.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But for how long a period of time?

Mr. BOLLING. The period of time is limited by the limitations of the National Housing Act and the limitations of the Disaster Relief Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all in sympathy with the purposes of this resolution and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have consulted with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] with reference to this resolution, and I think it is a necessary and important measure, and I do hope that it is passed quickly and expeditiously.

Last week I visited the devastated flood areas in Kansas. As I saw the stricken people returning to their homes, I realized that immediate and effective action should be taken to assist them in rebuilding and reestablishing themselves. I am happy to have had a part in proposing the first legislation designed to meet this problem. I want to congratulate our committee, the House Banking and Currency, upon its speedy action this morning in approving the legislation unanimously. The attitude of both the Democratic and Republican leadership of the House in expediting consideration of the measure is also gratifying. I am sure that this House will approve the bill unanimously, and speed it on its way.

The people of Kansas who have suffered the loss of their homes will be heartened to know that Congress can act efficiently and quickly to meet their emergencies. This legislation will not accomplish all of the things needed by our people, but it is a step in the right direction.

The provisions of the bill are simple, providing for 100 percent FHA insurance on houses to be constructed by people who have lost their homes due to the flood. It is hoped that this will, in a great measure, be beneficial in the long-range rehabilitation program.

Many people are now homeless, living in schools, auditoriums, and in the homes of their neighbors. The bill further provides for the erection of temporary shelters for these people until such

time as they are able to locate permanent living quarters.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the House pass this measure at once in order that this assistance may be made available without further delay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING:

Page 1, line 4, after "is hereby amended", insert:

"(1) By inserting after the word 'construction', in both places where it appears therein, the words 'or reconstruction'; and

"(2) Page 1, line 10, strike out 'satisfaction' and insert 'satisfaction'."

Page 2, line 1, after "destroyed", insert "or damaged to such an extent that reconstruction is required."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks at this point on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 303 will go a long way toward helping alleviate suffering, hardship, and homelessness in the flood-devastated areas of the Midwest.

In my home city, Kansas City, Kans., thousands are homeless, living in hastily provided shelters.

The city, county, and State has exhausted all of their resources in providing aid and comfort. Open-hearted individuals have provided homes and shelter for the homeless. The Red Cross and other agencies have done a remarkable job. But all these efforts were not enough to meet this emergency, the worst flood disaster in the history of our country.

Each community affected by this legislation will move swiftly to take all steps necessary to cooperate with Federal agencies in providing this absolutely essential housing. In fact, most of these communities have already taken some steps to be ready to immediately undertake this task of providing temporary living quarters.

I trust that the Senate, as has the House, will take immediate action. The need is not only great—the need is now.

THE KANSAS FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who represents a considerable part of the area that was overtaken by the recent flood disaster, I want to express appreciation for the prompt approval of this legislation. I trust there will be no unnecessary delay in its administration.

XCVII—580

The resolution provides for 100 percent Federal Housing Administration insurance on new homes that take the place of those totally destroyed or wholly made uninhabitable because of the flood disaster. This will give opportunity to those who want to reestablish their homes and begin again as nearly as they can where they were before this flood overtook them. It will also offer encouragement to people who are terribly distressed at the present time.

The resolution further provides for granting authority to the Disaster Loan Corporation to construct temporary housing that will take the place of homes lost by reason of the flood. These homes will be used by people who lived in rented houses, and will give another group of people, who have lost practically everything they had through no fault of their own, a chance to reestablish themselves in the communities where they had been living.

Mr. Speaker, you may be assured that the people of Kansas, who have suffered so much by reason of the great disaster that has overcome our country will, if given a chance, do everything they can to recover from the great misfortune over which they had no control.

The people of Kansas, who have met with these misfortunes, are ever grateful for the benefits they have received from those who have so willingly assisted them in time of trouble.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JUNE 29, 1951.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Texas my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Thirteenth District of Texas, such resignation to become effective on the 31st of this July.

Most sincerely yours,

ED GOSSETT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

RESIGNATION OF HON. ED. GOSSETT

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, some of my good friends and colleagues have made note of the fact that I am resigning from Congress. This decision comes as a result of long and serious consideration, and I take this floor for the last time with mixed emotions. Some of you have told me that I should be exceedingly happy to escape from the terrific pressure and the terrific responsibilities of congressional life. I would not leave, however, if I thought myself to be an indispensable individual or that my congressional district could not, and would not, be able to more than adequately replace me. Congressional service has become more and more difficult, and living in Washington has become less and less desirable in recent years. This we are forced to admit. It has become absolutely impossible for a man to do his full duty as a Congressman and to do his full duty to his family,

especially if he has five small children. It is for the Gossett family, and not for myself, that we return to Texas.

Perhaps these so-called swan songs should just as well be left unsung. Perhaps the retiring Congressman, like the now-famous old soldier, should just fade away. However, I know you will indulge me the privilege of saying only a few of the many things that I would like to express. First, let me say that for every single Member of this House I have the highest personal regard, and for those I have been fortunate enough to know well, I have the deepest affection. I wish that more people realized the high caliber of the men and women who serve in the Congress and the heavy burdens they have to bear. I wish they knew of the patriotic zeal and love of country which prompts you in your arduous work.

As I return to the practice of law and what I hope to be the practice of good citizenship, I am not changing ideas and objectives. It shall be my constant purpose and endeavor to be of public service. To that end, in my speeches and contacts, I will constantly remind those who will listen of several important things: First, that politics is the science of government, and is an ancient and honorable profession in which every good citizen should take an active part; second, that Congress has been, is, and must ever be, the bulwark of our liberties; third, that those who would destroy freedom and democracy always first attack the legislative branch of the Government and seek its destruction; fourth, that, if we would preserve America, our demands upon our elected representatives must be based upon the general welfare and not upon short-sighted selfishness.

To have served here is a high honor which will be cherished always by me and my family. I shall remain forever humbly grateful to the good citizens who have seven times elected me a Member of this Congress. Then I shall always remember, and forever be grateful for, the many generous and kind friends who have helped me discharge, with some degree of success, at least, the many responsibilities of congressional service.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to you and all my colleagues here I wish to say: May the Lord give you wisdom, faith, and courage in your difficult task. My prayers, hopes, and affectionate regards will continue to be yours.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my simple tribute to the distinguished Member from Texas, Congressman Gossett, who is resigning from Congress. I want to say to him that all of us, not only on the Republican side of the aisle but on the Democratic side, appreciate the splendid service he has rendered to his country. He is a man of high character, splendid ability, and served with the one desire to make America a better land and a better country. He brought a patriotic birthright into the public service. We are all sorry to see him leave. We have suffered a great loss. We hope for him and his family every blessing in the days ahead.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the feeling and the sentiment of every member of the Texas

delegation and, as a matter of fact, of every Member of the House, when I say that in the leaving of Representative Gossett from the Congress we all are losing the services of one of the most outstanding Members of the Congress. This certainly is true of the Texas district he has so ably represented for some 13 years.

It was the privilege of Representative KILDAY and me to come here to Congress with Representative Gossett. I had not had the opportunity to know him personally before I came here, but I had heard much about him. As every Member knows, Representative Gossett has been a real leader in the Congress, one who has led in the fight for those things in which he has sincerely believed.

He has always been a real leader. He was an outstanding student at the University of Texas. He was so recognized by his fellow students there by being chosen president of the student body of that great university. After he finished law school he became one of the outstanding lawyers, particularly in his section of Texas, then was a very successful district attorney in several counties in his section of Texas.

As all of you know, Representative Gossett is not afraid to fight for his convictions. We from Texas particularly are aware of the fact that in his efforts to be elected to Congress he sacrificed none of his convictions, and in his effort to remain a Member of Congress he has never sacrificed a conviction. He stands for something. No man can be motivated by a higher objective when elected to the Congress than to vote and stand for those principles in which he firmly believes. This has typified the service of Representative Gossett.

Furthermore, he has been one of those Members who has been willing to work on big issues, issues that have not been found along the beaten legislative path. Those of you who have been here during the years I have known that he has successfully carried forward a fight in which he believes with reference to the election of the President of the United States. He has received much acclaim and attention throughout the Nation for this fight.

It was evidenced yesterday that his influence is felt significantly by the membership of this body, for no other Member has worked more arduously and more diligently in behalf of the tidelands legislation, in which he sincerely believes: the passage of the tidelands bill yesterday is a tribute to the continuous effort made by Representative Gossett in behalf of this legislation. His committee, on which he and another great Texan, Hon. FRANK WILSON, of Dallas, serve, has done a great job on this legislation. Representative Gossett mentioned the fact that to some extent he has been a victim of inflation. We all know that he is an able man, we know that he has been and is an able legislator. I wish to say that perhaps in no manner does he excel more than in the manner in which he has reared and is rearing five of the most beautiful and remarkable children there are. We can understand why he would think first of

those whom he appreciates and owes such a great obligation, to wit, the members of his family, and in so recognizing their needs and their welfare is willing to forego an opportunity which he loves and appreciates, the opportunity to serve in the Congress. We all shall miss the services of Representative Gossett. We shall miss the vision which he has exemplified as a Member here. We shall miss his penetrating mind concerning the intricate subjects with which he has dealt. We shall miss every effort that he has made to perpetuate principles that are fundamental to this country.

We want you to know, Ed, as you leave the Congress today, that we shall be thinking of you; that we will be wishing for you and your lovely wife and those remarkable children every success and every happiness that can come to a deserving family. Your friendliness and your genuineness, your fearlessness, your constructive leadership will be not soon, if ever, forgotten; indeed, you will be recalled by all of us who have known you as one who has fought a good fight and who at all times has kept the faith.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is not always easy to find words to express oneself as you would want to when you see a good friend move from your midst, but in the Congress we have learned, and others will learn it about us, that as time passes people come and go. But I do say that of those who have left here, those who have resigned, in most instances have been the ones that we could hardly give up. It is not every Member that comes to Congress that makes a dent or impression upon political affairs or makes himself felt in the affairs of the Congress, but in Ed Gossett we have a man who has stood for the things he believed in, and he stood for them forcibly enough to make an impression on all of us. The quality that we all like about him is the fact that he can make a hard fight, and yet have the respect, love, and devotion of those who may differ with him. We are not going to take up further time, I know, by all of us saying things that are in our hearts, but we do wish him the very finest and the very best, because he has earned and deserves them. He has made a record of fine citizenship and outstanding congressional service; he leaves a high mark in the Halls of the Congress of the United States; he has done well for his country, and I think those of us who here remain will have learned much from Ed Gossett's career here. I hope in the future that we can live up to the high qualities that Ed Gossett possesses and which have been so well demonstrated by him in his service to his country.

We wish for him and his family continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this moment pass without joining my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who is not only my close personal friend, but—in my opinion—one of America's great statesmen, Ed Gossett. As were most of the other Members of the House, I was greatly disappointed to learn that he was

leaving this body, because I felt that men of his caliber were far and few between.

We are going to miss Ed Gossett. We are going to miss his voice in this Chamber. We are going to miss his companionship and his wisdom.

I can honestly say that in the time I have served in this House, I know of no man who has served the Nation and his constituency with more integrity, more sincerity of purpose, more ability, or more courage than has Ed Gossett. As he leaves these halls, I, along with his many friends, express the hope that happiness and prosperity will be his constant companions as he journeys down the road of life.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege now more than a dozen years ago to stand in the well of this House alongside the distinguished gentleman from the great plains of Texas who now absents himself from our presence, and with uplifted hands take the sacred oath and obligation as a Member of this highest and most powerful legislative parliament in the world's history.

I have had the good privilege to sit by Ed Gossett through the years, first on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and now for the past few years on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Our souls and minds seem to cleave together more than in the usual fashion, because not infrequently did we find ourselves on the same side of many of the most controversial issues coming before our committee.

I found him to be an astute student of the law. In this connection, I hope, as he returns to his first love, he will not find her as exacting as we were taught in olden days in that she was a jealous mistress. I hope that his charge will permit him to come back to Washington as often as he may.

I should like to make reference to his domestic life, his family life. As great as he is as a lawyer, from my own personal experience and observation I know that he is a devoted husband and a fine father. He is all that could be desired in a young man. We can ill afford to lose him.

It was said of Napoleon that his presence in the battle line was estimated to be equivalent to 100,000 men. Similarly is the presence of Ed Gossett in this Chamber. We felt comfortable when he was here, particularly those of us who come from the far southland.

Of course, we hope that his successor will be equal to him, but seldom do we find an all-around capable, conscientious, courageous, and devoted colleague such as Ed Gossett. We, of course, wish him well in his new undertaking.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the services of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gossett].

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with his other friends in wishing Ed Gossett Godspeed and every good wish that health, prosperity, and peace may accompany him throughout the years to come. I especially want to express my

great admiration for his lovely and outstanding wife and his children.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of strain and stress when our country needs men with the courage of their convictions, honest and sincere, and devoted to their country's welfare, it is a great loss to have Ed Gossett leave the House of Representatives. During his service here he has contributed much, he has always been fair, and he has made many friends. One always knows where he stands because there is no sham or pretense in his make-up. He is a fine man.

I wish him well in the days to come and hope that, busy as he may be in his new life, he will have the time to remember his friends, return to visit with them as often as he can, and realize that they are wishing him the best of everything, wherever he may be.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, sincerity of purpose is one of the most important attributes for a man holding public office. Ed Gossett has been a legislator who has not only had sincerity of purpose but has combined his deep convictions with a sharp penetrating mind. After watching Ed Gossett for the last 3 years I have been in Congress, I have come to the conclusion that Webster could coin a new antonym for fence rider, the word could well be "Gossett."

His character, personality, and ability have resulted in his rightfully assuming leadership on many of the most important issues which have faced the Congress.

We who have taken pride in his membership in the Texas delegation join with all Members of Congress in realizing the loss to Texas and the Nation in his retirement from public life. But knowing his almost inexhaustible energy and capabilities we know that he will be continually working for a better informed citizenry—an alert people who will zealously guard their heritage of representative government.

Ed, you have rendered the Nation a great service, your colleagues are better for having known you. We will be looking forward to seeing you often.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a few minutes of our beloved, mutual friend and colleague, Ed Gossett, on this the last day of his service in the House of Representatives.

In the retirement from Congress of Ed Gossett to the well-deserved life of a private citizen, we part company in our official association with a fine gentleman of high integrity and principle whose sound ability, strength of character, wisdom, courage, and common sense have set him aside as one of the great and outstanding men who have served their country in these Halls of Congress.

Ed Gossett's service to his district, the State of Texas, and our country is immeasurable and has always been characterized by steadfast adherence to principle, honor and right, and the courage of his convictions.

I am particularly fortunate that Mr. Gossett will be my constituent and is moving to Dallas in a very fine position. Although his loss here will be keenly felt

by his many friends, we all wish Ed Gossett well in his future undertakings which he so richly deserves.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to the fine tributes which have already been paid to our hard-working and able colleague, Ed Gossett. Nothing has been said with which I would in any way disagree, and, if time would permit, I might even recall some little personal services which Ed in his official capacity has from time to time rendered to me in my problems.

In his opening remarks a few moments ago, Ed touched on a matter which I believe should be carefully considered by the Members of the House in the immediate future. I am concerned that Ed felt that he must leave the Congress in order to adequately support his young family. That unfortunate circumstance poses a problem which ought to be of the greatest interest to the Nation and to the Congress. Here is a comparatively young man with his congressional apprenticeship well behind him occupying now a place of importance in the deliberations of this essential governing body. The salary which the people pay him is not adequate and so he turns to private industry and leaves the public service on the threshold of his period of greatest influence. This process is repeated too frequently in public service.

You and I know of other colleagues of ours who are contemplating the same step. Some men, of course, become tired of public service with its constant drain on a man's patience and its innumerable calls for personal services which are undoubtedly a privilege to perform but which to some must become a burden. Other Members when they entered public service never intended that it should be their careers. They merely wanted the background of congressional experience for later use in private affairs and practices. These reasons are understandable and nothing can be done about them. However, the great number of those who leave Congress go because they cannot, in justice to their families, afford to remain. Ed Gossett is an excellent example of this last category.

If these fine tributes to him are deserved—and we know that they are—then the Nation can ill afford to let him and those like him leave public service. Let us hope that those of us who remain behind him in the Congress may have the courage to take the obvious course to eliminate the financial aspects of the problem.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that I rise to express my personal regret at the departure of my good friend Ed Gossett from this House of Representatives. I hope that the record which I have made here during my service with him discloses my admiration and, indeed, my attempt at emulation. Such a man as Ed Gossett inspires imitation, and I frankly confess that I have sought to be like him.

Mr. Speaker, I daresay that Ed Gossett would not be leaving these Halls were he not a parent—a parent of a rather large family, in these days. The responsibility of bringing up five chil-

dren is a tremendous one and I speak from experience, myself, when I say that the income which a Member here receives is certainly insufficient. It is a sad commentary upon public service that officials like Ed Gossett must be lost to the people because the salary which is offered for this position is inadequate for the raising of a family. Of course, my fellow Members here know only too well that in addition to bringing up a family, if fortunate enough to have one, we who are elected officers must bear the expense of political campaigns every 2 years. I know that Ed Gossett, while he has not had serious opposition in his district for years, has taken this action because he wants to exercise his talents in a way which will produce the highest standard of living for his family.

The honor came to me not long ago to represent the Texas delegation at a testimonial dinner for Ed Gossett among his new neighbors in Dallas. At that time I expressed, I think, the universal admiration which was felt for him among his colleagues here. I told his new friends and neighbors that Ed Gossett was not one who reckoned the political effect of a roll-call vote, that he sought to serve his country first, above the demands of politics or personalities. I cited the results of his efforts here, which I need not now repeat, and I expressed my envy that they were obtaining the Gossett family as their new neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, as much as we love him, not one of us who knows Ed Gossett's reasons for his resignation would have him return. He is entering into a place of even higher responsibilities than he has borne here, for he is carrying his experiences as a legislator back to the people as an enlightened private citizen. In such a capacity he may, and I am sure he will, increase his stature as a citizen of America.

Joining with all these others of his friends who have spoken here about him, I wish for Ed and Mary Helen, and all Gossett children a fond godspeed.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Ed Gossett leaves this body today. We will miss him personally and we will miss his very great ability, his tireless energy, his clear-thinking approach to all problems.

He leaves a warm spot in the hearts of each of us. There is a closeness in the Texas delegation which heretofore I have found only in the Army in combat. Any vacancy saddens all of us.

Ed Gossett brought honor, dignity, and respect to our State, our delegation, and this body.

As he leaves, we wish for him and for his lovely family great happiness and contentment.

A record of honorable and able service in the House of Representatives is one of great distinction. As he leaves Congress today, Ed Gossett holds such a record.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with others in saying something about Representative Ed Gossett who is leaving this body.

He is a great American, a conscientious and courageous legislator and he

will be greatly missed in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOSSETT is indeed a pillar of the Republic. His service here has been an unselfish and patriotic service. I know that he leaves us carrying the good wishes of every Member of this body.

I personally wish to extend to him and to his fine family my best wishes for a very fine future in every respect.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend, Ed GOSSETT, is today completing an outstanding term of outstanding service. Ed came here of his own volition, to serve his State and Nation. He served well and honorably. He leaves of his own volition, with the satisfaction of a big job well done.

He and his family return to their neighbors, and their friends, in Texas. We are the poorer because of his loss, but I feel a degree of satisfaction in the knowledge that Ed and his family will be in the surroundings they so properly love. Our best wishes to you, Ed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal regret that I learned that our colleague, Ed GOSSETT, of Texas, was resigning from the House of Representatives.

I have served with him in the years that he has been in Congress, and I feel that his resignation from the House is a great loss both to the State of Texas and to the Nation.

I regard him as one of the scoundest statesmen and most profound lawyers that I have served with during my years in the House.

While he has always been conservative, he has always been fair and he has always been tolerant of the views of those who disagreed with him.

His pleasant and affable conduct toward his colleagues in all circumstances have made him beloved by all who have served with him.

While I feel a deep personal sense of loss at his leaving the House, I wish him well-deserved success and happiness in the new field which he is about to enter.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very unhappy day for me—the day that the House takes official notice of the retirement from Congress of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. Ed GOSSETT and I have been associated together in many ways and upon many occasions through the years and I regret very much to see our paths separate. I think perhaps I have known Mr. GOSSETT longer than any other Member of the House. He and I were students together in the early twenties at the University of Texas. We participated together in student activities there and on one occasion, memorable to us at the time, we tied for first place, along with some other student whose name I no longer remember, in a contest designed to select the best extemporaneous speaker in the university. Not much came of the contest and the oilman who had offered the prize money went broke and we did not collect the funds which we had so devoutly sought. However, our friendship has endured and brought dividends of pleasure through the years.

When we had finished our formal schooling at the university, Mr. GOSSETT

and I entered the practice of law and he became district attorney in one part of west Texas and I became district attorney in another area of west Texas. We were students together, we were district attorneys at about the same time, and we have served in Congress together since January 1939.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of keen personal loss that I mark the departure from Congress of my old-time friend, Ed GOSSETT. Moreover, there are other ties which bind us together. Mr. GOSSETT's mother is a citizen of Post, Tex., within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and members of the Gossett family live in the general area. The Gossetts are the right kind of people. They are real Texans and real Americans. The characteristics which have been exemplified here by Congressman GOSSETT are typical of the sturdy Americanism of the Gossett clan.

At a special luncheon given by the Texas delegation honoring Mr. GOSSETT last week many of us took advantage of the opportunity to pay tribute to him and express regret over his departure from Congress. Upon that occasion, however, our choice words were reserved for Mrs. Gossett and the five Gossett children. Mrs. Gossett and the children were not present, but they received the plaudits of the assembled delegation.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss Ed GOSSETT and his lovely family. But, really, this is no time for good-bys. After all, geographical location is not as significant as it once was, and we shall claim the privilege of seeing the Gossetts whenever possible at their new home in Dallas, Tex., and we shall exercise the happy privilege of remembering them always as friends worth having.

So, to you, Ed, may I say, good luck and God bless you and your family. You have written a record in public life of which you and your family can always be proud. As you have sought in every possible way to promote the American way of life here, everybody who knows Ed GOSSETT knows that when you return to the State of Texas you will carry on the good work.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana and its people today lose a friend in Congress, a dear and close friend, in the resignation of Ed GOSSETT.

Ed GOSSETT's place in the hearts of Louisianians comes not only from the closeness of the great State of Texas but from the things which Ed GOSSETT and the people of Louisiana have in common.

The great majority of our people in Louisiana believe in the things Ed GOSSETT believes and thinks like Ed GOSSETT thinks.

We both hold sacred the high principles which motivated the founding fathers of this country when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. We both have consistently refused to accept any other philosophy of government other than that upon which this Nation was built.

We still stand fast in defense of those same principles and those of us who

remain after Ed GOSSETT has gone pledge to him our determination to carry on the fight where he left off and to hold aloft the lighted torch of individual freedom and private enterprise.

It is fitting and proper that Louisiana's Representatives in the Congress should join in paying tribute to Ed GOSSETT because it was only yesterday that he stood in the front ranks fighting with every weapon at his command to preserve and protect property rights which the people of Louisiana held sacred to themselves. Obviously I mean his fight in the interest of the so-called tidelands bill. I feel we could not have achieved the victory which we did without the undying courage and tenacity of Ed GOSSETT.

It was not yesterday that he began the fight. It was years ago but it was yesterday that he saw his banner planted on the ramparts of victory and as long as we carry on in the spirit of Ed GOSSETT it will wave there.

In the name of the people of Louisiana I say to Ed GOSSETT, "Thank you for a job done and done well."

In my own name I wish Ed GOSSETT success in his new field. He goes with the best wishes and heartfelt admiration of his colleagues. What more could any man desire from those with whom he has served so long.

In Ed GOSSETT is exemplified the finest type of representation under our American system of government. It has been a privilege to know him. I wish him Godspeed.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, may the richest blessings and the best things of life come to our esteemed colleague and his splendid family as he leaves the halls of this Congress and assumes duties which he has chosen to accept.

I must admit a feeling of personal loss by reason of Ed GOSSETT's going because of his wise counsel and his strong leadership. His advice has often been sought on fundamental issues arising almost constantly and from his cooperation and willingness in this respect, I have found great assistance and guidance in his help.

In these times there is the call for men of strong convictions, regardless of party or popular acclaim. Ed GOSSETT has been such a legislator, as has been evidenced by the many statements made on this floor. He is a man of this caliber and his services to his constituents and to the Nation is truly, in my opinion, a severe loss.

Ed GOSSETT has served well. He has been true to the trust and confidence which has been placed in him as a public servant. At this time there are doubts in minds of many regarding the worthiness of public officials. It is tragic to me that many people tend to confuse a few rotten apples in the barrel and rain down indictments by association. As a result, by such confusion and misunderstanding, confidence is lost in government—not only in its leadership, but actually in the system of government which has made us a great people and a great Nation. Ed GOSSETT has been one of those statesmen of our time who engenders confidence by his unyielding

devotion to duty and his deep sincerity of purpose.

We will miss him here but rejoice he is going into more fertile fields and in a position which will afford a greater happiness for himself and family. His record and his influence will live long among us who have had his official and personal association here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Ed Gossett from the House of Representatives is a severe loss to this body, as indeed it is to his district, to the State of Texas, and for that matter to the entire Nation.

We all know Mr. Gossett to have been one of the truly profound and outstanding Members of the House. I believe it is safe to say that he more nearly reflected the thinking, the temperament, the courage, and the independence of the average Texan on Main Street during the period of his service here than did any other Member of our delegation, and that is no reflection on the rest of us because we all strive to do so. But somehow Ed has had a way of asserting that Texas thinking, of vitalizing it, of making articulate and of applying it to the humdrum of everyday legislative life.

I believe it was Confucius who once said that to see what is right and not to do it, is lack of courage. The gentleman from Wichita Falls is one person who has never been accused of want of courage, whether measured by that or any other yardstick. He has never hesitated to go to battle when the cause of right and justice, as he saw it, was being challenged, and when the best interest of his district and of the Nation was involved.

Mr. Speaker, when we study the lives of the great and near-great men who have served here or elsewhere in public life, we hardly find even honorable mention given men of expediency—the sort who go along just for the sake of going along, following the line of least resistance and thinking in terms of political rewards or of some temporary advantage, real or fanciful. The men who live in history are those who stand for something and are willing to fight for it, who dare swim against the channel of momentary unpopularity, if need be, in order to achieve or maintain a principle. It has been just such men as that, symbolized in the record of Ed Gossett, that has made America the strongest remaining bulwark in this world against the inroads of communism and creaking socialism.

It will be recalled that on a great decision day in Israel it was Joshua, a man of few words but of mighty deeds, who single-handed turned the tide toward God and right. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve," he began, and when he did thus speak he made a challenge and an appeal that thrilled the nation like the blast of a trumpet. Men of decision live in history and live in the hearts of men.

So it has been with our friend, Ed Gossett. There has never been any doubt in the minds of honest men as to whom he chose to serve while in the Congress. He has courageously and con-

sistently cast his lot with those who believe in the Constitution, in the rights reserved to the States in that document, in the welfare of the Nation as contrasted with the special interest and high-pressure groups who constantly gnaw at the vitals of our American institutions.

Mr. Gossett has never been known to waver in his devotion to a principle, has never yielded to that easy and enticing line of least resistance in the application of his courage and statesmanship; has never hesitated to champion a good cause, and he has lashed out time and again against evil in all its forms and applications.

I join in wishing Mr. Gossett and his family Godspeed, with a full measure of happiness and success in his new endeavor.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Reserves Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit during general debate today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Baring	Hall,	Price
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	Rabaut
Blatnik	Hall,	Redden
Bosone	Leonard W.	Regan
Breen	Irving	Rogers, Colo.
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Saylor
Busbey	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Scott,
Camp	Kersten, Wis.	Hugh D., Jr.
Case	Kilburn	Shelley
Celler	Kilday	Short
Chatham	King	Sikes
Chenoweth	McDonough	Smith, Kans.
Coudert	Machrowicz	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Ill.	Spence
Dawson	Morgan	Staggers
Dingell	Morton	Stockman
Durham	Moulder	Taber
Eberhart	Murdock	Thomas
Ellsworth	Murray, Tenn.	Velde
Elston	Murray, Wis.	Vinson
Engle	O'Neill	Vursell
Fisher	Perkins	Watts
Gamble	Pickett	Werdel
Gillette	Poulson	Whitaker
Golden	Powell	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 358 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the Part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 775)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 17, 25, 103, 109, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 125, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "twenty-nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,824,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$4,234,533"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$202,767,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$38,104,672"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$10,698,514"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "\$6,678,196"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line two of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "or", insert "by it"; and in line four of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "persons", insert "which"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment and before the period, insert: "Provided, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger

motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines four and five of the matter inserted by each amendment, strike out the words "one hundred and fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one hundred and ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 10½, 14, 24, 40, 53, 57, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 83, 108, 124, and 129.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to
amendment No. 131),
IVOR D. FENTON (except as to
amendment No. 131).

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

Amendment No. 1—Expenses: Appropriates \$158,670 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$174,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides that not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Southeastern Power Administration

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$275,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of four automobiles, instead of five as proposed by the House and three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Continuing fund: Reported in disagreement.

Construction, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,375,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,564,400 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides within the total amount appro-

priated the sum of \$500,000 for miscellaneous construction, \$250,000 for the purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission facilities of others, and \$810,600 for continuation of construction of the facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to the western Missouri project, it is expected that a determined effort will be made by the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities to obtain a contract that will make unnecessary the use of this appropriation for such project and that no new obligation will be incurred under authority of this appropriation for such project unless the Secretary of the Interior determines, after such negotiations, that additional facilities of such project are required to be constructed by the Government for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not to exceed \$586,800 of the construction appropriation shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10½: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Strikes out the limitation upon the use of funds for construction of the western Missouri project, as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,255,712 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Transfer of certain facilities, Denison Dam project

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the purchase of eight automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of fifteen as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out unnecessary language.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 17—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,530 as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION Construction

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$62,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to defer action on the La Grande-Baker line owing to incomplete information indicating its immediate need. It is suggested that the Department make a further study and re-submit the authorization when more complete information is available.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification agreed to by the conferees that force account personal services shall not be included within this limitation.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,368,439 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 22: Strikes out unnecessary language.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 23—Management of lands and resources: Appropriates \$7,722,605, deletes earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and provides that not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; instead of making an appropriation of \$6,900,000 without a limitation on personal services, as proposed by the House. This action ratifies the Senate approval of \$1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, even though it will not be earmarked in the bill.

Amendment No. 24—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to amend the basic law relating to the distribution of receipts from sale of timber from the re-vested Oregon and California grant lands.

Amendment No. 26—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of twenty-nine automobiles, instead of thirty-two as proposed by the House and twenty-five as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses: Deletes the paragraph making one appropriation of \$65,000,000 for all of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Health, education, and welfare services

Amendment No. 28: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$41,824,750, instead of \$43,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,324,750 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved for health, education, and welfare services includes \$400,000 to continue public assistance contributions to Indians in Arizona, and an additional \$100,000 for placement services, making a total of \$600,000 for placement services.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate. In approving this limitation it is the intention of the conferees that it not be applied against the budgeted amounts for personal services of medical personnel, school teachers, and others essential to the hospital, disease preventative, and curative services and the educational assistance programs.

Resources management

Amendment No. 32: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 33: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$10,921,360 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 37: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Provides that not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 41: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$3,300,747 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Revolving fund for loans

Amendment No. 45: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma

Amendment No. 47: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$22,655 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the purchase of one hundred and sixty automobiles instead of one hundred and ninety-one as proposed by the House and one hundred and twenty-five as proposed by the Senate.

Tribal funds

Amendment No. 52: Makes a grammatical change.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$4,500,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the action of the Senate in approving \$100,000 for investigations of the Collbran project, Colorado.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that not to exceed \$4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$3,163,396 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that \$3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,903,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$202,767,725, instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$208,535,450 as proposed by the Senate. The allotment of the appropriation to the projects covered by the budget estimates is left to the administrative determination of the Secretary of the Interior with the understanding that funds will not be allocated in excess of the respective sums indicates in column four of the project breakdown appearing at pages 15 and 16 of Senate report No. 499, and that there will be no allocation of current year or prior appropriations for any project item not heretofore appropriated for or included in the fiscal 1952 program presented to Congress or for any project item eliminated by the action of the House, the Senate, or both, upon the budget estimates, with the following exceptions. The managers on the part of both Houses agree that of the 1952 appropriation \$191,000 is to be available for operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal, as provided for in the Senate report, that \$500,000 is to be available for the initiation of construction of a single circuit 230-kilovolt transmission line, for other than customer service, from Folsom Dam power plant to interconnect at the nearest feasible point with the east side Shasta-Tracy transmission line; that the Secretary should make available from unobligated balances of prior appropriations approximately \$1,463,000 for emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico; and that the proposed allocation of an additional \$185,000 to the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, is not approved.

It is to be understood that this action by the conferees expressly denies any appropriation for the following transmission facilities.

Central Valley project, California

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line.....	\$1,400,000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations..	300,000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations	450,000
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39.....	2,100,000
Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation.....	700,000
Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations	201,170
Keswick-Shasta Dam area FUD 115-kilovolt line and substation	105,308
Elverta-Sacramento switchyard..	150,000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	5,406,478

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado

The \$100,000 included in the 1952 Budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line has been disallowed, but, for the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line \$100,000 has been approved for the 1952 program.

Minidoka project, American Falls power division, Idaho

	Amount of 1952 estimate
American Falls power plant.....	\$1,067,000
American Falls switchyard.....	133,000
Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam)	100,000

Total 1952 estimate disallowed..... 1,300,000

Transmission division, Missouri River Basin

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	\$753,450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and substations	703,000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	85,000
Yellowtail-Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	810,000
Sioux City-Omaha line.....	207,463
Omaha substation.....	70,242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line.....	118,428
Storm Lake-Denison-Holland Omaha line.....	30,624
Sioux City-Sibley line.....	467,643
Additional reduction.....	500,490

Total 1952 estimate disallowed..... 3,746,340

The managers on the part of both Houses strongly reaffirm the language contained in the House Committee Report accompanying H. R. 3790 with reference to prohibiting the proposed inter-connection of the Central Valley Power system and the Bonneville Power system. Reports have been received that work on the proposed inter-tie has continued despite the categorical denial in the reports issued by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate this year and approved by both Houses of Congress, and a similar categorical injunction last year approved by both Houses of Congress denying the use of funds for this purpose.

The Conferees hereby request the Secretary of the Interior to submit immediately a full and complete report including disciplinary action taken by him in this case.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that not to exceed \$38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$29,160,408 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,202,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$15,977,594 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,094,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 66: Provides that \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 68: Provides that not to exceed \$10,698,514 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$10,331,434 as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,478,203 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Provides that not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Emergency fund

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Transfer of facilities, Fort Peck project, Montana

Amendment No. 72: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes not to exceed \$50,000 for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74: Increases to \$100 per day the amount that can be paid for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50 per day as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77: Strike out limitation inserted by the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83—Coachella Distribution System: Authorize expenditures of not to exceed \$2,783,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed \$1,684,000 as proposed by the House, for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system; make the expenditure of such funds mandatory as proposed by the Senate, instead of permissive as proposed by the House; and instead of requiring a definite repayment arrangement in advance of expenditure as proposed by the House, adopt the proposal of the Senate that such expenditure shall be repayable unless it shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that the irrigation district is not liable therefor. Amendment No. 83 is reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$21,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$21,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85: Provides that not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$16,858,603 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,950,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved \$356,000 for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, such sum to be absorbed from the total appropriation approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources. The entire amount of the budget estimate for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas has been approved by the conferees. No reduction is to be made in the sums to be available for personal services with respect to the two afore-mentioned activities: \$91,775 is to be available for personal services at the Laramie Station and \$545,572 is to be available for personal services at the Bartlettville Station.

Amendment No. 87: Provides that not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$1,587,412 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House. This action includes approval of \$350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyoming, for research by the Bureau of Mines on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. The ores to be experimented with are different from bauxite ores found in other areas of the country. In approving this appropriation it is the intent of the conferees that, even though the experimental operations will not be financed from this appropriation, no research shall be conducted at this station on processes or methods whether patented or not unless all royalty and other beneficial rights to developments or discoveries from such research accrue exclusively to the Government.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$1,176,841 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Provides that not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection

Amendment No. 92: Provides that not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates \$7,369,790 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$11,370,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96: Provides that not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates \$1,171,774 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,284,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 98: Provides that not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Management of resources

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$6,678,196, instead of \$6,870,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,606,558 as proposed by the Senate. This action restores the amount of \$263,442 contained in the budget estimate for river basin studies except that the entire sum appropriated is to be subject to the reduction in funds to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 100: Provides that not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Investigations of resources

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates \$3,358,986 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to prevent the use of this appropriation for investigations, surveys, and similar work in foreign countries.

Construction

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$733,742 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Provides that not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates \$806,631 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$882,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 107: Provides that not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 108—Administration of Territories: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska public works

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides that not to exceed \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111: Provides that not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 112: Provides that not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, as provided by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114: Provides that not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions (Alaska Road Commission)

Amendment No. 115: Provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the construction appropriation be available for force account work as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed 25 percent as proposed by the House.

Virgin Islands public works

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$992,970 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117: Provides that not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Inserts a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for waterfront development work on St. Thomas and provides that the amount in-

cluded in the 1952 budget estimates for such work be made available for school and hospital facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Administration, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 119: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: Appropriates \$2,154,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 120: Provides that not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Rescission of unused contract authority

Amendment No. 121: Strikes out the word "unused" and in lieu thereof inserts the word "unobligated", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Changes the effective date of the rescission from June 30, 1951, as proposed by the House, to June 30, 1952, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Adopts the Senate proposal to strike out the words "except public works in the Virgin Islands."

Transfers of property—Office of Territories

Amendment No. 124: Reported in disagreement.

Virgin Islands Corporation

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$2,595,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Expenditures for informational and propaganda purposes

Amendment No. 126: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for propaganda purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes; but modifies the Senate proposal by adding at the end thereof a provision that the limitation shall not apply to the publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys or to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

Limitation on employment of chauffeurs

Amendment No. 127: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the employment of chauffeurs of Government-owned cars but restricts its operation to the District of Columbia and excepts the automobile assigned to the Secretary and that assigned to the Under Secretary.

Employees engaged in personnel work

Amendment No. 128: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the number of persons to be engaged in personnel work, but changes the proposed ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen employees to one such employee to one hundred and ten employees.

Antistrike provision

Amendment No. 129: Reported in disagreement.

Expenditures during final quarter of fiscal year

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the expenditures for certain purposes during the last quarter of the fiscal year to not to exceed the average quarterly amount of such expenditures during the preceding three quarters of the fiscal year, except where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authorizes otherwise. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive last-quarter purchases be prevented so that accumulated last quarter balances revert to the Treasury.

Limitation on filling vacancies

Amendment No. 131: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the Jensen amendment

which was inserted by the House and also strikes out the proposal of the Senate to add a provision which would enumerate reductions already made in the various paragraphs throughout the bill as a substitute for the Jensen amendment. The conferees have agreed to amendments to the House bill which have the total effect of reducing the sums available for personal services by \$13,841,606 below the amount requested in the Budget for 1952 for such purposes.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to
amendment No. 131),
IVOR D. FENTON, (except as to
amendment No. 131),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, this report is the best we have been able to work out with the Senate. I trust that the recommendations of the committee will be accepted. That is the only statement I care to make, Mr. Speaker, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JENSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 3790 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 131.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 51, noes 64.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 170, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—189

Aandahl	Bishop	Crumpacker
Abbott	Blackney	Cunningham
Abernethy	Boggs, Del.	Curtis, Mo.
Adair	Bolton	Curtis, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Bow	Dague
Allen, Ill.	Bramblett	Davis, Ga.
Andersen,	Bray	Davis, Wis.
H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Denny
Anderson, Calif.	Brownson	Devereux
Andresen,	Budge	D'Ewart
August H.	Buffett	Dolliver
Andrews	Burdick	Dondero
Angell	Burton	Doughton
Arends	Bush	Fallon
Auchincloss	Butler	Fellows
Ayres	Byrnes, Wis.	Fenton
Baker	Canfield	Ford
Bakewell	Chapfield	Forrester
Beall	Church	Fugate
Beamer	Clevenger	Fulton
Belcher	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Bender	Cole, N. Y.	Gavin
Bennett, Mich.	Corbett	George
Berry	Cotton	Goodwin
Betts	Crawford	Graham

Gross	Latham	Scrivner
Gwinn	LeCompte	Scudder
Hagen	Lovre	Seely-Brown
Hale	Lucas	Shafer
Hall,	McConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Leonard W.	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Halleck	McGregor	Sittler
Hand	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Harden	McVey	Smith, Wis.
Harrison, Va.	Mack, Wash.	Springer
Harrison, Wyo.	Martin, Iowa	Stanley
Harvey	Martin, Mass.	Stefan
Herlong	Mason	Talle
Herter	Morrow	Taylor
Heselton	Miller, Md.	Thompson,
Hess	Miller, Nebr.	Mich.
Hill	Miller, N. Y.	Tollefson
Hillings	Morano	Towe
Hinshaw	Mumma	Vall
Hoeven	Nelson	Van Pelt
Hoffman, Ill.	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Hoffman, Mich.	Norblad	Vaughn
Holmes	O'Hara	Vorys
Hope	Ostertag	Vursell
Horan	Patterson	Weichel
Jackson, Calif.	Phillips	Werdel
James	Potter	Wharton
Jarman	Prouty	Wheeler
Jenison	Radwan	Widnall
Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Johnson	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Jonas	Rees, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Jones,	Riehlman	Wilson, Tex.
Woodrow W.	Robeson	Winstead
Judd	Rogers, Mass.	Wolcott
Kean	Rogers, Tex.	Wolverton
Kearney	Sadlak	Wood, Idaho
Kearns	St. George	Woodruff
Keating	Schwabe	

NAYS—170

Addonizio	Gore	Morrison
Albert	Granahan	Multer
Allen, La.	Granger	Murphy
Anfuso	Grant	Norrel
Aspinall	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Bailey	Greenwood	O'Brien, Mich.
Barden	Gregory	O'Konski
Barrett	Hardy	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Passman
Battle	Hart	Patman
Beckworth	Havener	Patten
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Bentsen	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Polk
Bolling	Hedrick	Preston
Bonner	Heffernan	Priest
Boykin	Heller	Quinn
Brooks	Hollifield	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Ramsay
Bryson	Hull	Rankin
Burleson	Jackson, Wash.	Reams
Burnside	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Ribicoff
Carlyle	Jones,	Richards
Carnahan	Hamilton C.	Riley
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Chelf	Kee	Roberts
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Rodino
Clemente	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Keogh	Rooney
Combs	Kerr	Roosevelt
Cooley	King	Sabath
Cooper	Kirwan	Sasser
Cox	Klein	Secret
Crosser	Kluczynski	Shelley
Deane	Lane	Sheppard
DeGraffenried	Lanham	Sieminski
Delaney	Lantaff	Smith, Miss.
Dempsey	Larcade	Staggers
Denton	Lesinski	Steed
Donohue	Lind	Stigler
Donovan	Lyle	Stockman
Dorn	McCarthy	Sutton
Doyle	McCormack	Tackett
Elliott	McGrath	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	McGuire	Thornberry
Feighan	McKinnon	Trimble
Fernandez	McMullen	Walter
Fine	Madden	Welch
Flood	Magee	Whitten
Fogarty	Mahon	Wickersham
Forand	Mansfield	Wier
Frazier	Marshall	Willis
Furcolo	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Garmatz	Mills	Yates
Gary	Mitchell	Yorty
Gordon	Morris	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—74

Armstrong	Blatnik	Brehm
Baring	Bosone	Buckley
Bates, Mass.	Breen	Busbey

Byrne, N. Y.	Hunter	Rabaut
Camp	Irving	Redden
Case	Javits	Regan
Chatham	Kennedy	Rogers, Colo.
Chenoweth	Kersten, Wis.	Saylor
Coudert	Kilburn	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Scott,
Dawson	McDonough	Hugh D., Jr.
Dingell	Machrowicz	Sheehan
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Short
Durham	Meador	Sikes
Eaton	Morgan	Smith, Kans.
Eberharter	Morton	Spence
Ellsworth	Moulder	Taber
Elston	Murdock	Teague
Engle	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas
Fisher	Murray, Wis.	Velde
Gamble	O'Neill	Vinson
Gillette	Perkins	Watts
Golden	Pickett	Whitaker
Gossett	Poulson	Wood, Ga.
Hall	Powell	
Edwin Arthur Price		

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. McDonough for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Armstrong for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Golden for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Byrne of New York, against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Hunter for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Wood of Georgia for, with Mr. Irving against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Case.

Mr. Pickett with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Teague with Mr. Meador.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Javits.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, across the front page of the Washington Daily News is Army Secretary Frank Pace's warning that an attack on Iran and Yugoslavia by Russia may be imminent, and that "the United

States may be fighting a third world war at any moment."

With the war in Korea still undecided, with the Chinese Communists building up their forces—as the Pentagon has warned—while the peace talks are on and when we have one of the top military men telling us that on two new fronts our men may be conscripted to fight in world war III—and for what? Is it to protect the British oil interests in Iran to sacrifice American men for British trade dollars? Should we not take a look at the outfit which is dragging us into this new mess?

Our refusal to accept the advice of Washington and Jefferson to avoid entanglements in the affairs of other nations is bearing bitter fruit. Is it not well that we reexamine the policy which ties us into United Nations? Is it not imperative that we now give some thought to the character of the nations to which the internationalists have bound us in this one-world organization?

In the Times-Herald of Sunday is an article by Col. Robert R. McCormick which is well worth reading, especially by those who have been citing the action taken by the Original Thirteen Colonies in establishing the United States of America, as a similar move. The columnist's statement is as follows:

When President Truman denounced the conviction of Associated Press Correspondent Oatis by Czechoslovakia, he omitted to say that Czechoslovakia is an original member of the United Nations. A great deal has been said of the conviction of the Catholic prelates in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, secured by torture-induced confessions, and the oppression of religion in Poland, and again the fact that these countries were members in good standing in the United Nations has been avoided.

The prevailing habit of misstatement, half truth, and no statement has pretty well persuaded the ignorant that the United Nations is an enlightened, beneficial, even holy organization. The worst the well-informed thought of it was that its highfaluting language was a fraud to cover the sinister acts that got us into the Korean war.

When the organization was formed under the leadership of Alger Hiss, his treason was undreamed of; nor was the decision of the appellate court of California that it is the supreme law of the land contemplated, which partly but not entirely excuses the Senators who, under pressure of propaganda and political coercion, voted for its ratification.

The 60 countries which compose the United Nations are not similar in history, race, religion, language, and law, as were the Thirteen Original States, and as are the 48 present States. They can be divided into classifications: primitive, dictatorial, iron curtain, countries with ineffective or no constitutions, subject states, aggressor states, states with religious political parties, polygamous states, and Socialist states.

Among the primitive states, I find Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Israel, Lebanon, Thailand, India, and Pakistan, all of them polygamous.

The dictator states: Argentina, Dominica, Paraguay.

Iron curtain states: Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russian Soviet, Byelorussian Soviet, and Red China, which the State Department is conspiring to recognize.

States with undesirable or no constitutions: Egypt and New Zealand. Canada has no constitution, but proximity, history, and close intercourse have implanted our principles on all but the professional hatchet men and Rhodes scholars.

Aggressor states: England, which not only oppresses Egypt and Burma, but also Scotland and Wales; France, which oppresses north Africa and Indochina; the Netherlands, which oppresses Indonesia; Australia, which oppresses Borneo, and New Zealand, which oppresses several peoples in the Pacific.

The avowed purpose of the United Nations was mutual assistance against aggression by anyone. It is to be noted that no effort has been made to stop the aggressions of Britain in Egypt and Malaya; of Holland in Indonesia; of France in Morocco and Indochina; of Belgium and the Union of South Africa in Africa.

Within the last few weeks, Britain, France, and India have stated that they would join the United Nations in protecting their own possessions, but would consider whether to aid any other countries that are attacked when such a situation should arise. Of the 60 members, only 16 have sent forces to Korea, and these only token forces, except for the United States.

States with religious parties, thus violating our principle of the separation of church and state: Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, and France.

Socialist states: England, Denmark, and Sweden.

States with constitutional governments are Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Luxembourg, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, and Sweden. Some of these constitutions are obviously shaky.

The three solid Republics in the world are the United States, Turkey, and Uruguay. As I have said before, a large majority of useful inventions have been made in the United States. Of the other United Nations, only Britain, France, and Italy have made any at all.

I am not considering the countries of central and south Africa which I have not visited.

France and Great Britain, so long the dominant nations of the world, have fallen on hard times. Britain, for lack of a constitution, has become a socialized state, tyrannized over by the party in power in the House of Commons and far nearer in theory and practice to Russia than to us.

The peripatetic gyrations of France in the last 12 years are too well known to need comment. Its strongest party is the Communist Party. Both England and France have treaties of alliance with Soviet Russia.

The Appellate Court of California has held that the United Nations Charter, as the supreme law of the land, repealed the California law forbidding Japanese to own real estate in California, on the ground that the Charter was "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

By the same theory, it would hold that the laws forbidding polygamy in this country discriminated against people practicing that custom. Ladies supporting the United Nations, bear this in mind.

The United Nations is proposing a declaration of human rights and a companion piece, a convention on freedom of information, which would replace the first amendment to our Constitution, providing for freedom of speech and of the press, with a very dangerous code to suppress freedom of religion, speech, and the press.

The genocide convention adopted by the United Nations and sent to the Senate by President Truman would render illegal a great deal of standard literature, including the New Testament.

Between the dictator states, iron curtain states, Socialist states, and primitive states, we might get a statute providing for communism and socialism in this country. That may well be the administration's object.

As well put by the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger: "The Supreme Court has never expressly declared any treaty ratified by the Senate invalid.

"This Supreme Court has upheld a law enacted to place teeth in a treaty after it had declared the same law unconstitutional before a treaty was ratified.

"This instance of the Supreme Court ruling that the treaty-making power could be used successfully where the Constitution forbade the Congress to act is pointed to by Frank E. Holman of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an article in the September issue of the ABA Journal, entitled: 'Treaty Law Making: a Blank Check for Writing a New Constitution.'

"Here's how it came about: In 1913, Congress enacted a Federal Migratory Bird Act. After its approval by the President, its constitutionality was questioned on the grounds that it invaded the reserved powers of the States, and the statute was declared unconstitutional in 1914 by the Supreme Court in *United States v. Shauver*. The Court held:

"That the National Constitution is an enabling instrument and, therefore, Congress possess only such powers as are expressly by necessary implication granted by that instrument is not questioned. Unless, therefore, there is some provision in the National Constitution granting to Congress either expressly or by necessary implication the power to legislate on this subject, the act cannot be sustained."

"Supporters of the regulations governing the taking of migratory birds then sought the treaty route. The President concluded a treaty with Great Britain, and the Senate ratified it.

"A second Migratory Bird Act was then enacted. It was practically identical with the first, and it was attacked as unconstitutional also.

"This time, the Supreme Court, in *Missouri v. Holland*, upheld the law as valid, since it was implementation of a valid treaty.

"This decision," Mr. Holman writes, "in effect, and really for the first time, opened the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate."

"This is nothing more nor less than government by treaty.

"We can lose such right as freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of peaceful assembly if our Senate by 34 of its 96 votes ratified as a treaty the covenant on human rights."

It is plain that 40 of the 60 United Nations countries do not subscribe to our ideas of constitutional government, and many more are uncertain, and that any agreements that they can reach will be utterly destructive of our way of life.

It is equally plain that all informed people who support the United Nations plan just that.

Colonel McCormick might have added that the 13 colonies had at least a somewhat common objective and similarity of thought, believing in what we refer to as Christianity—another point in common was that the people of each colony came to America to escape persecution, excessive taxation and tyrannical authority. Finally they all agreed in open convention upon the principles

laid down in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights.

As Colonel McCormick clearly pointed out—

It is plain that 40 of the 60 United Nations countries do not subscribe to our ideas of constitutional government, and many more are uncertain, and that any agreements that they can reach will be utterly destructive of our way of life. It is equally plain that all informed people who support the United Nations plan just that.

With the last sentence I cannot agree, for many "informed people" sincerely believe that we can join and follow United Nations, surrender a portion of our sovereignty, but not lose our independence. I know well-informed individuals just as patriotic as I, who are entirely convinced that if we would be saved we must join United Nations. They belong to that group referred to in the good book as "having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?" Some never learn.

The Colonel might well have added that if and when a "show down" comes, and come it will, we will find each one of the 60 nations, if it thinks it is powerful enough, in determined disagreement with our views. Recent aid given to the Communists with whom we are at war in the Far East by Britain and other nations illustrate this point.

For my country I want no hauling down of the Stars and Stripes, no surrender of our independence, no Armed Forces of American youth fighting under an internationalist flag and commander, for the interest of some other nation, or group of nations.

I am beginning to wonder just how many wars those who advocate membership in—subjugation to—a one-world organization, United Nations, think this country can survive.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A HOSPITAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2094, with Mr. DEMPSEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I ask about the time for discussion on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour; 30 minutes on each side.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is some difference of opinion on this side. I think the chairman handling the bill on that side is in favor of the bill as is the ranking minority Member of this side. We would like some understanding as to whether the opposition will be recognized. I should like to have 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know who is asking for control of the time on the Republican side.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and I ask the gentleman from South Carolina whether he will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] claim 30 minutes of the time?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the author of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple bill. We already have on the statute books an act which is known as the Hospital Center Act, which was approved August 7, 1946, and which is Public Law 647 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

When that bill was reported favorably to the House it provided for an authorized expenditure of \$35,000,000. Of this sum about \$22,000,000 was to be made available for three hospitals, which were to comprise the Hospital Center. The balance was to be available for all other hospitals in the District which could qualify.

On the House floor the section dealing with the hospitals other than the three in the Center was stricken by a floor amendment, although the Committee on the District of Columbia reported out the bill in 1946 as I have described.

Later, in 1947, H. R. 5307 was reported favorably out of the District Committee, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] handled the report at that time for the committee.

The purpose of this is to restore to the hospital center bill the provisions that were originally contained in the bill reported out in 1946 and also as intended by H. R. 5307, which was reported out in the Eightieth Congress.

This bill, however, occupies a different status than the bill reported in the Eightieth Congress in relation to these hospitals that will benefit, in that the District Commissioners have made a favorable recommendation on this bill. In the Eightieth Congress the recommendation was not favorable, but so far as the bill before the committee now is concerned the Commissioners of the District have made a favorable recommendation. This bill could benefit some 12 hospitals in the District. Whether or not all of them will seek the benefit of it is one thing, but it could benefit about 12 additional hospitals.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman explain why the District Commissioners have made this change in their attitude?

Mr. McCORMACK. The change in their attitude was because in this bill there is a formula provided for the repayment by the District of its share, a specific formula that was not contained in the previous hospital center bill or in the bill of the Eightieth Congress; in other words, to pay back 3 percent over a period of 33½ years, a specific provision to that effect.

Under this bill any hospital must raise 50 percent. Of the remaining 50 percent the Federal Government makes contributions, which will amount to 35 percent of the whole amount, and the District Commissioners 15 percent of the whole amount.

Then there is provision for the District Commissioners paying back their 15 percent to the Federal Government over a period of 33½ years.

There appeared before the Subcommittee of the District of Columbia that was hearing this bill a number of witnesses. At the present time there are three voluntary nonprofit hospitals serving the community that benefit from the hospital-center bill. One of the witnesses was William E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, and he testified in substance that the present hospital center consists of three hospital units, the Emergency Hospital, the Garfield Hospital, and the Episcopal Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospital. He also testified that a hospital plan for the center has been worked out and that while no actual construction work has started, the funds have been appropriated to start the project and there already exists the contract authority up to \$21,700,000 to complete it. The delay has been over the selection of a location.

The bill I have introduced has the following advantages. It spells out clearly the manner in which the District of Columbia will meet its obligation under any construction program, namely, 3 percent a year, which I refer to.

Second. It includes other hospitals in the District of Columbia—nonprofit hospitals, most of whose buildings are old and in bad shape physically.

Third. It would give a distribution of hospital facilities throughout the area.

Commissioner F. Joseph Donohue testified and strongly favored the bill.

Paul B. Cromelin, representing the Sibley Hospital, chairman of the board of the Sibley Memorial Hospital, also testified.

This hospital comes under the program of the Methodist Church. It is one of the projects of the Women's Society of Christian Service, a national organization conducting some 50 or more schools and hospitals and missionary training schools and orphanages throughout North America.

Mr. Paul B. Cromelin testified that many of the people they treat cannot even pay in part for their treatment. The same situation exists with relations

to all hospitals. The first building of this hospital was erected in 1895. Other buildings were erected in 1903 and another building in 1913, and an annex to the main building was built about 25 years ago. He testified they do the laundry work for Providence Hospital which is located in the District of Columbia and which will benefit by the passage of this bill. He said there is a definite need for rehabilitation of these old buildings and the plant and for an extension of our program. In Washington, Sibley Hospital conducts a hospital consisting of hospital, plant, and in addition a nurses' training school. It has about 120 nurses training at the present time. About 40 nurses graduated last June. He emphasized the fact that this hospital is in the dire need of new facilities. It contains about 350 beds. Last year they performed about 6,000 operations. About 250 babies were born each month, or a total throughout the year of 2,954 babies. It has the advantage of placing facilities close to the people who need to use them. There is need for a modern hospital. Sibley will be able to maintain more patients each year than before.

The hospitals that will benefit by the passage of this bill, and it is not confined to these hospitals, are as follows: Sibley Memorial Hospital, Casualty Hospital, Homeopathic Hospital, and the Providence Hospital.

I have here testimony of other persons who appeared before the committee. During debate under the 5-minute rule I shall take the floor and call attention to their testimony. For example, John M. Arem, president of the Sibley Memorial Hospital, also appeared and testified. There was Daniel W. O'Donohue, Jr., representing the Providence Hospital. There were other witnesses representing another hospital who appeared before the subcommittee and testified.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Is it not a fact that most of these hospitals which the gentleman has mentioned are run on a charity basis completely and that they do all sorts of charity work for which of course they are not paid?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely.

Mr. O'HARA. Is it not also true that the hospital situation in the city of Washington at the present time is in a very serious condition, both as to the plants of the hospitals and their need for enlargement, and the demands upon them are terrific?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. As the debate continues we will disclose that fact.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation in the Eightieth Congress, when the plight of these hospitals was brought to our attention. Mr. Donohue came before us and was an excellent witness. Due to his testimony and the honesty with

which he presented his case, we did extend the District funds in welfare cases through the appropriation bill to Providence, Sibley, and the Episcopal Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospitals; we extended welfare-fund benefits to at least three or four additional hospitals. The charity-case costs were a heavy and a dangerous load. At that time I think only four hospitals were permitted to receive help from the Welfare Department, repayments for charity-case costs.

Mr. McCORMACK. Three of them.

Mr. HORAN. Due to that fact, I hope the House will act with favor upon this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

In conclusion I make this further observation: that this does not increase the authorization. The authorization in 1946 was for \$35,000,000. So there is no increase in authorization. The commitment to the hospital center is about \$21,700,000. This permits the balance to be used in accordance with the provisions of the law to help other hospitals in the District, just the same as the Congress did in relation to the three hospitals that now constitute the hospital center. So there is no additional money. There is no additional authorization. It is something that the District needs, and as the debate develops I am sure we can satisfy Members of the House that there is a justifiable need and justification for the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. O'HARA. I will be glad to yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Dr. John M. Orem, superintendent of Sibley Hospital, said:

For all practical purposes Sibley Hospital serves the public and practically operates as a public hospital. This is due to the exigencies of the District of Columbia and the peculiarities of the District in relation to hospital facilities.

He further said that if this bill were enacted into law his hospital would be able to make a greater contribution to the medical-requirement needs of the people of the District. He further testified that if we did not have these hospitals function in a modern way the effect on the District would be disastrous. He also said that his hospital, which, as I said, was founded by members of the Methodist Church, treats persons without regard to race, color, or creed. That was his testimony, and he is to be commended.

The same thing applies to all other hospitals. They treat persons without regard to race, color, or creed. Furthermore, they treat them whether or not they have any money. They do not ask them when they come in if they have any money.

Furthermore, the District has to serve the metropolitan area. The metropolitan area has about 1,400,000 population, and the District about 820,000. The allocation under the Hill-Burton Act is

based on 820,000 rather than the metropolitan population of 1,400,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the metropolitan hospitals in Maryland and Virginia get aid under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but it is inadequate, and the testimony presented to the committee from reliable medical authorities shows that the hospitals in the adjoining counties, like Montgomery, while very excellent, are inadequate to meet the demands made upon them, and that the major part of the patient load has to be treated in hospitals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what the city of Washington badly needs increased hospital facilities. Neither is there any question that unless this bill is passed as reported out of the committee the District will not obtain those facilities. I understand there may be some opposition to the bill; that an amendment will be offered to increase the amount to be contributed by the city of Washington. I believe Washington is in a somewhat different position from other cities in the country. While I believe normally a 50-50 division is a fair one in the question of Federal aid to hospitals, Washington stands in an exceptional position. The entire country and people from every section of the country will share in the benefits of these hospitals.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do we not pay for those facilities?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course we pay for the facilities, but few hospitals can operate at a profit.

Washington is also limited in its opportunities for raising money. It cannot obtain loans with the freedom of the other cities and the States. It cares for a large area outside the confines of the city itself, located in Maryland and Virginia. People from outside areas come here for treatment because the facilities are better. Any campaign for funds is restricted because many people make their charity contributions to their home communities. As a matter of plain justice to Washington, I favor the bill and want to be so recorded. If any amendment is offered to increase the burden on Washington, I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, as a physician who has operated a hospital for more than 20 years I think

I am in position to speak rather frankly about hospital situations in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia there is no question that more hospitals are needed. We have some hospitals here, as in other communities, that need repair, that need additions, that need some help. The Congress set up the Hill-Burton bill on a formula of allocating funds to different communities throughout the Nation on a formula of population base, and income base. The District income is high.

The gentlemen who preceded me say the District of Columbia does not get very much funds under the Hill-Burton bill, but I point out that perhaps one reason is that we have the highest per capita income in the District of Columbia of any place in the United States. So, on that basis, they should not be coming here and asking for help under this bill.

We passed the hospital bill back in 1946. It was to allocate some \$35,000,000 for a hospital center. At one time they thought it would be built on the Naval Observatory grounds, but they did not find a place until recently; they thought it might be built out on the old Soldiers' Home grounds. Of the \$35,000,000, \$12,000,000 was to be allocated to hospitals that did not come in. There were three hospitals coming into the hospital center—and this is important—of the three hospitals that are to come into the hospital center, when they come in they deed their property to the District of Columbia; they would get out of the hospital picture entirely. I think that is as it should be, 100 percent participation.

Under the Hill-Burton bill at one time we provided one-third, then a half, and, in some instances, I think, two-thirds—a very few of those—participation within the cities and counties and States. The thing that we have here in this bill as I see it and under the Hill-Burton bill, the District has not been forgotten; they get \$275,000 a year; they received \$1,375,000 under the Hill-Burton bill since it has been put into effect. The District has already had many millions, the Georgetown Hospital, the George Washington Hospital were 70-percent grants, the Freedmen's a total gift. The Congress has been liberal. There are 820,000 people in the District. What did the State of Massachusetts get out of the Hill-Burton bill? With a population of nearly 4,600,000 people that State received \$8,000,000 on about the same basis as we get it here, because Massachusetts is a very rich State. What did they get in Minnesota? Minnesota with nearly 3,000,000 population received \$8,000,000. Minnesota is not quite as rich. North Carolina with a population of 4,000,000 received nearly \$17,000,000 because it is a State with a big population and low income. So the Hill-Burton money does not reflect against the District of Columbia.

I point that out because Mr. Johnston, when he came before our committee, and he is the one that is going to administer this bill, said:

It is, however, more liberal for the District of Columbia than the Hill-Burton bill.

This measure is designed just for the District of Columbia. We have these three hospitals that want to come in. Providence is the only one that is ready to come in, a very fine Catholic hospital. A Methodist hospital would like to come in. Now I think it is a very dangerous procedure when we let religious organizations put their hands into the public till to take out tax money to add to or to build hospitals when they do not try to do that for themselves. All over this country religious organizations have gone out and asked their people to contribute for hospitals and the people have done that over and over again.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. It is true that under the Hill-Burton bill they also come in. The gentleman recognizes that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, but very, very few came in under that bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not true except in cases where it became a part of the hospital program of the State.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. Under the Hill-Burton bill the State must set up its own organization and allotments for hospitals are made to the State machinery. Here in the District of Columbia, the District Health Department makes the decisions. That is the department or the machinery through which Hill-Burton funds are allocated to the District of Columbia, and Hill-Burton money has been allocated to the tune of \$1,375,000 in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Does not the gentleman agree with me in the statement that the situation in the District of Columbia is a little different from the other cities of the United States? The District of Columbia and the city of Washington present an entirely different problem. Many of us have our permanent residences out in the States, our voting residences, we pay our State-income tax there. I think many people who live here in Washington recognize insofar as contributions are concerned the primary responsibility to make those contributions back in their home States, the States of their residence. Does not the gentleman think that sets up a little different situation here in the District?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As the gentleman from Washington has said, the Appropriations Committee made some money available to these hospitals for charity work. We have done that through the Congress, not under this new policy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana, the Congress

has already recognized that situation. The Congress has authorized the construction of a hospital center for the District and that law has been passed. The Congress has also appropriated 70 percent of all the dollars that went into Georgetown Hospital, the Congress appropriated and gave to George Washington University 70 percent of all the dollars that went into that hospital and it constructed Freedmen's Hospital 100 percent. So the Congress has already recognized that situation and has contributed dollar after dollar after dollar after dollar for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia, and we think there ought to be an end to it at some time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. I do not think the gentleman from Indiana needs to worry about the Congress not contributing to the hospitals of the District of Columbia. If we had towns at home with a population of a million people that got as much money out of the Federal till through the avenues just elucidated by the gentleman from Mississippi, we would be mighty well off. Let me say this to you, too. You talk about charity hospitals. Sure, they do charity work. I did charity work in my little hospital, \$40,000 in 10 years, and I marked it off the books. Every hospital does some charity work, and do not forget, too, that when you go into a hospital in the District of Columbia that the average charge is \$16.11. That is what they charge whether your secretary goes or whether you go in as a patient. You pay an average of \$16.11. My goodness, out in Kimball, Nebr., I thought I was lucky to get \$5 a day. Well, it is different now. Many of the hospitals make money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman mean \$16.11 per day?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. In a ward?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. That is the average charge. So, it is not all charity work. If you were to look at the balance sheet of Providence Hospital and Sibley Hospital and others, you would find that they are not in the red, even though they are doing some charity work. Bless your hearts, I am in sympathy with what the hospitals have to do, because I know some of the problems of a hospital. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts, said a bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress that contained these provisions. Well, the bill was reported out but it never came before the House. That was the Dirksen bill. It was never before this body for consideration. At that time the District Commissioners opposed the bill. Now, with a change of complexion, the District Commissioners come in and they are in favor of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Back in Minnesota, in my district, we have had considerable difficulty even getting little,

if any, consideration out of the Hill-Burton Act allocations. Just where does this additional money come from that is provided in this bill? And, is that money going to have to be replaced by the taxpayers at some future date?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This bill provides that the hospitals may participate up to 50 percent. That does not mean that they put up the money. These hospitals own land and have many assets. Providence Hospital, for instance, wants \$3,000,000, and they will get half of it. I think the District should be charged for all of it, just as we are charged in our cities at home.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman propose an amendment for repayment of the entire sum?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The amendment I expect to offer as a substitute for the bill will require the District Commissioners and the people in the District of Columbia to pay back the money that goes into hospitals of this type. I think that is only right. We do it at home and every other place, and there is no reason why these people should not do it. The District Commissioners have a balance of \$2,500,000. My colleagues, the District of Columbia is in a better position than the Federal Government. They can raise the taxes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It would seem to me that such a proposal to be offered by the gentleman from Nebraska would be eminently fair. I do not see why the House should object to passing his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, I hope they will. I did not vote for the hospital center bill because I did not feel that some of the provisions in it were proper. We spent 4½ hours debating it in the House where 109 Members voted against it. Some \$21,000,000 have been earmarked for the hospital center. We have these hospitals coming in, and they need money, but in the process of getting it, it seems to me that the people of the District of Columbia ought to be treated just as we treat our folks back home. We should say, "Yes; there is money available here, but you are going to have to pay it back over a period of 25 years in equal installments." What is wrong with that? You do it at home. Why should we not do it here?

I am fearful that we in Congress do something to people. We take away something from them when we do everything for them. We give them this and we give them that. We destroy that self-confidence, that ability to do something for themselves. Certainly in the case of these strong church institutions that can go out and raise money, and have done it, and God bless them, they have done a great job in the hospital field, and they ought to continue to do it. I doubt if the Congress should permit these fine religious institutions to put their hand into the public till and say, "We are going to get some tax money and we are not going to pay anything back," then I think that proposition is wrong; deadily wrong.

Ninety percent of the funds that have been allocated under the Hill-Burton Act went to city hospitals, county hos-

pitals, or State hospitals. It seems to me that twelve million for the hospitals is too liberal. The principle is wrong.

I say if they want to get this money, then let the people of the District of Columbia pay back the money that is going to come under this bill. When you start doing these things, what about the loss of our strength of character? What about the generations that are going to follow us? Because we are borrowing this money from all the people in the United States. What about our grandchildren, when the bill is due? You and I are saddling them with a debt and an obligation such as we have never seen before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not need to talk about the generations to come. He can talk about the children that are here today, not our children's children.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Certainly; I do not think we ought to be raiding the Federal Treasury to meet community needs. That is what it amounts to when you come down to this bill. There are certain intimate duties and responsibilities that citizens should assume. This is one. This Congress should not break down these responsibilities.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, this bill ought not to pass in its present form. I dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with my majority leader, the author of the bill. I am very fond of him. I can appreciate his interest in the legislation and the sincere manner in which he has approached it. Nevertheless, in all good conscience and to satisfy my own convictions, I feel that I should take the well of the House and oppose passage of the bill in its present form.

This legislation is new to many of you. It has a very long history running over a period of about 6½ or 7 years. The legislation was originally introduced by the former Senator from Maryland, Mr. Tydings. After holding hearings the Senate committee reported out a hospital bill which provided for the establishment of a hospital center in the form of a corporate body, permitting many hospitals in the District of Columbia to participate in the hospital center.

After the bill passed it came over to the House, and the proponents thought they had done so well that they would go a little further and seek more free Federal money. So they changed the form of the bill. They eliminated the corporate feature and provided for a direct Federal grant from the Federal Works Administrator for the establishment of a hospital center to be under the control of the Federal Government.

Having made very satisfactory progress in that field some of the private hospitals, and I cannot blame them, felt that they should get in on the gifts, so they came in and were included in the bill.

The bill came to the floor of the House in 1945, and the very provisions, almost in identical words, which you are asked to pass here today for the benefit of private hospitals, were defeated by the House of Representatives. Since that day there has been a very vigorous effort carried on by the proponents to get the private hospitals in under the cover of a direct Federal grant from the taxpayers of the 48 States.

The hospital center which is now authorized and which will be very largely paid for by the Federal Government will sooner or later become a part of the hospital facilities for the people of the District of Columbia. I do not know why it has not been constructed. The authorization is on the books. I understand they are just waiting to take over some particular piece of naval property as a site, and the reason it has not been constructed is because they do not seem to be able to get that property.

There is one question to be decided and that is whether or not in addition to the benefits of the Hill-Burton Act—the only source that the people in your own State have to look to for Federal money for hospitals—you are willing to make additional moneys available to the District of Columbia which your people in your own States and districts contribute in the form of taxes.

I pointed out a moment ago in answer to the gentleman from Indiana that the Congress has certainly met its responsibility, if it has any responsibility, in building hospitals for the people in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government contributed 70 percent of every dollar that went into the construction of Georgetown Hospital. The people paid and the Federal Government contributed 70 percent of every dollar that was put into the George Washington Hospital. Your people paid that. The Federal Government contributed every dollar that went into the construction of Freedmen's Hospital, and your people paid for that. Your people will also pay to the extent of approximately \$20,000,000 that which will go into the construction of the hospital center and only a small portion of that will be returned to the Federal Treasury.

It is not a very pleasant task to oppose legislation sponsored by close friends. On the other hand, I have a very deep feeling about this matter. I am as familiar with it as any Member of the House because I have sat on this committee for about 8½ or 9 years and during 7 years of that time this legislation has been before the committee. In the original instance this legislation was referred to a subcommittee of which I was for a long time chairman, but for some reason when the same bill was referred this time it was not referred to my Committee on Health and Education. It occurs to me that is where a bill of this kind should be referred.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I think the gentleman is probably giving the impression that somebody sidetracked him, but I think,

if the gentleman will recall, the original act was before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, because I remember sitting in on the hearings for some time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, I hope my friend is correct, but the report that was filed before came from the Committee on Health and Education. That is what the report shows.

Now, this is what those of us who oppose this bill propose to do, and I think it is more than fair. I honestly believe that it is more than fair. I do not feel that the Federal Government, by any stretch of the imagination, is duty bound to make any contribution whatsoever to these hospitals. I do not feel that the Federal Government, by any stretch of the imagination, is in duty bound to loan one dollar for the construction of these hospitals, but as a compromise of the whole problem—and I concede it is a compromise—the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and I intend to sponsor an amendment which will make available a Federal loan for the purposes in the bill. We propose to offer an amendment which will loan to them your money without a dime interest—not a dime. It is to be repaid over a period of 25 years. I think that is more than fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the problem which is before the House today is one which deals solely and peculiarly with the situation which exists in the city of Washington. I remember when I sat in on the hearings of this original legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress as a member of the District of Columbia Committee. I remember at that time I approached it with some feeling of suspicion. I felt it was giving some consideration unduly to the city of Washington, which was beyond what was being measured out to the States under the Hill-Burton Act. As time went on, and I accumulated more and more information, as I lived here longer, I felt that we had a problem in the city of Washington which is distinctly different from any that we have in our States back home.

It also happens that I sat as a member of the subcommittee on the committee which brought out the Hill-Burton Act, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I became a strong supporter of that bill, and I have lived long enough to see the many fine accomplishments that have resulted from that legislation. When you start talking about what comes to the District of Columbia under the Hill-Burton Act, one of the important things which was a part of the formula of the Hill-Burton Act was the area. Of course, no State would be hit as hard as the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. No; I do not yield at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The basis is not area but population.

Mr. O'HARA. I will yield to the gentleman later on but not now. The gentleman did not yield to me.

There are a number of reasons you could give your people back home why you did not vote for this bill; you could tell them you did not want the people in the District of Columbia to "get away" with something. That might be a perfectly good argument; yet, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a very practical proposition. We have crowded into the city of Washington not only the members of our staff, the Members of Congress, but thousands and tens of thousands of people who are connected with the operations of Government. I do not think there is anyone, even my friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], who would not agree that the hospital situation in Washington is very serious. There is a great deal of expanding to be done in the plants and facilities of the hospitals in this city to meet the needs of this particular area and those hospitals that have been mentioned as the charity hospitals, where they do render a tremendous service of treating and taking care of the sick of this community, and in many instances are not paid when the people cannot pay them.

I hope this bill will pass in the form and in the language which it carried when reported out of the committee. It is true that the gentlemen who spoke against the bill opposed it. I do not remember anybody else in the District of Columbia Committee who did oppose the bill. I recognize that they are sincere in their opposition, but I do urge that the bill be not amended, and repeat that this legislation has been given very serious consideration by the committee. I hope it will pass in the form in which it was recommended by the committee.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the formula of the Hill-Burton bill. The gentleman stated that it was on an area basis. The bill very definitely states in section 2 that it is on a population and per capita income basis. The reason the District of Columbia may get a little less than other areas is because the income per capita in the District of Columbia is higher than any place in the country. The area has nothing whatever to do with it; it is on a population basis.

Mr. O'HARA. I think the gentleman will find that an amendment was adopted to the Hill-Burton bill which included area in the formula. Certainly the needs of a community or the needs of a State enter into it, and that, of course, is a lot different in the various States.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Assuming that what the gentleman has said is correct, that the hospital situation in the District of Columbia is very bad, and it may be, although I think it is just as bad in many cities around the country, and assuming further that the Hill-Burton Act does not give the people of the District of Columbia the relief to which they are entitled, is not the approach to this

thing an amendment to the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. O'HARA. No; I do not think so. I think we have to deal with this problem by legislation, and this Congress is charged with the responsibility of legislating for the District of Columbia, and I think we have to legislate as a body which is charged under the law to do so. Personally, I always hope that responsibility remains with the Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the central hospital center bill and worked hard to get it through the committee. I supported it on the floor of the House. I supported this bill that is before us today not because I think we particularly owe the District of Columbia anything, but I do think we need additional hospital facilities here and much better hospitals than we have. The hospital situation in the District of Columbia is certainly serious. I have had some experience with the hospitals here due to illness in my own family, and I know of the hospital shortage from first-hand information.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to keep the record straight. On July 22, 1946, when the bill was up for vote the gentleman is recorded as not voting.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thought I was present and voted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There were 162 who did not vote, so the gentleman was not alone in that respect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. To keep the record straight also, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] handled this bill on a favorable report, substantially the same bill as this, with a favorable report?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is not so. It never came before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill was reported out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is not one word of debate in the legislative procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am asking the gentleman, Was not the bill reported out?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did not the gentleman from Nebraska handle it from the committee?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, and the District Commissioners were opposed to it, but it never came up on the floor of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not handle a bill unless he was favorable to it, would he?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman knows it did not come up on the floor of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman handled it?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now the gentleman opposes the very bill he handled in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is an entirely different bill. The gentleman knows that. Be honest with yourself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony presented to the committee on this bill was very convincing. Having two brothers who own a hospital in South Carolina and knowing the conditions under which they are operating at the present time, doing about 33 percent each year of charity work, I would like this bill to apply to the whole United States. We do not spend enough money in this country on hospitals and similar public health. I agree that the churches and the States should spend more of their own money in taking care of hospitalization and in taking care of the sick in general; but that does not relieve us of the responsibility of trying to relieve the situation in the District of Columbia today.

I hope the bill will pass, even though, as I stated, I do not feel we are particularly duty bound to do it. We have helped hospitals in the District of Columbia more than we have in any other ten States combined; still, we are compelled to stay here, we compel Government employees to come here and work and it is our duty to see that they have proper hospital facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know of a Government employee either in our office or in any other branch of the Government who has never paid a bill after he went to a hospital?

Mr. McMILLAN. I agree with the gentleman and I do not understand myself how the hospitals continue to go into the red charging \$16 a day.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has the gentleman looked at their records? I happen to be a director of the Columbia Hospital and I attend those meetings. They are not running in the red and I know the other hospitals are not running in the red, either.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946, is amended by striking out "acquire land and construct buildings" and inserting in lieu thereof "acquire land, construct buildings, and make grants to private agencies."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia,' approved August 7, 1946, is amended by striking out 'acquire land and

construct buildings' and inserting in lieu thereof 'acquire land, construct buildings, and make loans to private agencies.'

"SEC. 2. The first section of such act of August 7, 1946, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) to make loans to private agencies to enable such private agencies to make surveys and investigations, to plan, design, construct, remodel, relocate, rebuild, renovate, extend, equip, furnish, or repair hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. Each such loan made under this subsection shall be charged against the District of Columbia and shall be repaid in full to the Federal Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in equal annual installments, without interest over a period of not more than 25 years: *Provided*, That in no event shall the amount or value of the loan exceed 50 percent of the value of the hospital plant of a private agency as improved with the aid of such loan: *Provided further*, That, except in the case of the construction and equipment of a new hospital, no such loan shall be made to any private agency unless such private agency shall obligate itself to pay at least 50 percent of the cost of any project for which such loan is made.

As used in this act, the term 'private agencies' shall mean any nonprofit private agency operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia."

"SEC. 3. The fifth section of such act of August 7, 1946, is amended (1) by inserting '(except subsection (c) of the first section)' after 'act' the first time it appears therein and (2) by striking from the first sentence thereof the words 'at such times and in such amounts, without interest, as the Congress shall hereafter determine', and by inserting in lieu thereof 'at the annual rate, without interest, of 3 percent of such 30 percent.'

"SEC. 4. The title of such act of August 7, 1946, is amended to read as follows: 'An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, to authorize the making of loans for hospital facilities to private agencies in the District of Columbia to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of loans for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to give assurance that this amendment has been very carefully drawn. It was drafted by the legislative counsel.

When I was in the well a few moments ago I called your attention to the fact that the bill as it was reported from the committee authorizes grants of Federal money to private hospitals. I told you that I would offer an amendment which would be sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], which would authorize the Federal Government to lend to the people of the District of Columbia or to their private hospitals an amount of money to carry out the objectives of the bill. The lending provision is a very liberal one. It provides that the money, which would be collected from your people, will be loaned to them without interest over a period of 25 long years. It means that the money would be paid back at the

rate of only about \$500,000 a year, maybe \$600,000 a year. I do not know of anything any more liberal than such a provision unless it be a direct grant as the bill provides. If the people of my State, whose hospital facilities are far inferior to those in the District of Columbia could get a loan from the Federal Government on terms like that, they would jump at it, and your people would, too.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I did not hear the gentleman's amendment read, but I assume you used the same language as in the bill which would, unintentionally, I believe, limit the aid to those nonprofit organizations which are presently operating.

Mr. ABERNETHY. My amendment limits the loan to identically the same hospitals that would be entitled to receive grants under the bill.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which would simply extend this to any nonprofit organization which may be formed or may be operating or in the process of being formed at the present time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What you want to do is what has been going on for 5 or 6 years. We started out with a hospital center and then we increased that by bringing in all the existing private hospitals, and now what you want to do is to take a third step and bring in those to be hereafter established.

Mr. KLEIN. No, it is not. All I want to do, and I am sure the gentleman would not have any objection because the committee would have no objection to a similar amendment to the pending bill, is instead of using the words here, "as used in this act the term 'private agency' shall mean any nonprofit private agency operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia" my amendment would say "either now or in the future" operating hospital facilities. By that I mean if a nonprofit group were to be formed here.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I see. If another nonprofit group were to be formed here, you would want them to be cut in on it.

Mr. KLEIN. Exactly. Would the gentleman have any objection to that?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think we might as well include those and get them all in now, because I imagine a number of them would be persuaded to organize in the next few days after this bill passes, on the presumption that they too can come to Congress and get some free money. I do not think there is any question about that. I think the amendment is all right. We might as well include all future private hospitals if we are to include any.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a similar amendment. Now, what would be my position if the gentleman's amend-

ment is adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. It could not be amended after it is adopted.

Mr. KLEIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN to the amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: After the word "agencies" insert the words "either now or in the future."

Mr. KLEIN. As the proposed bill reads at the present time, and I assume the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi reads the same way, it says:

As used in this act the term "private agencies" shall mean any nonprofit private agencies operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see nothing wrong with the gentleman's amendment if we are going to make it possible to have loans without interest. It gives the District some advantages over our towns at home, but, as someone has said, we are in a little different position here. This does make a loan, not a grant, which is paid back by the institutions that are able to pay it back.

Mr. KLEIN. I might say to the gentleman I have discussed this with both the ranking minority member and the chairman of the committee, and they have indicated they will accept it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I assume the gentleman is looking into the future and has in mind some agency that might be formed that would participate. Can the gentleman tell us what agency might be formed to participate in this?

Mr. KLEIN. The reason for my offering this amendment is that I have spoken to a Member of the House who told me that there is a group of doctors at the present time who are in the process of forming a group to build a nonprofit hospital here in the District.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They want the Government to let them have the loan?

Mr. KLEIN. No; they simply felt that it might be possible for the language of this bill to be interpreted in such a way as to say that it applies only to those nonprofit agencies which were in existence at the time of the passage of this bill. Therefore, they want to make sure they will be brought in under it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There are some doctors that have spoken to the gentleman that want to form a hospital and the gentleman wants to get them in?

Mr. KLEIN. They would have to comply with the same provisions as would any other organization.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to take a position that differs from that of my distinguished friend from New York, whom I admire very much. However, the purpose of this bill relates to existing hospitals. The amendment of-

fered by the gentleman from New York, while it is offered to the substitute, and if the substitute is defeated, which I hope it will be, it will be offered to the bill, would relate to future hospitals, of course within the \$35,000,000. It would not be for all time. I want to state that frankly to the committee. This relates to the remainder of about \$11,500,000 of an original \$35,000,000 authorization. I think the amendment of my friend without some tangible evidence of a real effort in existence to establish some other hospital, should not be adopted. That someone told my friend from New York about a group of doctors that might propose it is so vague and so uncertain that we should confine the bill to the intended purpose, as relating to hospitals already operating. Of course, these hospitals have operated for many decades in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if either one of these amendments is adopted it will probably mean no legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then there will be a lack of hospital facilities in the city?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Under those conditions I certainly hope the amendments will be defeated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

There is a lot said about the Hill-Burton Act. The District of Columbia occupies an entirely different position than States and Territories. The formula under which the allocations are made, as we know, not only includes population but is weighted heavily by the per capita income of the State or Territory.

The District has limited boundaries and is adversely affected. The District's allocation is based on its population of 802,000 legal residents, while the actual population of the metropolitan area is 1,464,000.

In nearby Virginia or Maryland they cannot provide themselves with the necessary hospital facilities. The needs of these communities must, to a great extent, be met by the District of Columbia hospitals.

For example, in a report published in 1950 by the Montgomery County Hospital Facilities Advisory Committee it is reported that while the county has three fine hospitals, with a total bed capacity of 455, the hospitals of the District of Columbia provide the greater portion of the total hospitalization required by the people of that county. That same condition applies in all territories adjacent to the District of Columbia which might be termed "Metropolitan Washington." So that extra \$500,000 is not included.

On the question of income, a great deal of income is lost by reason of the fact that so many persons pay their income taxes elsewhere, as the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] so ably stated earlier in debate.

When drives are made for funds, my contributions in the main are given to drives in my own city and my own State. While I do not say this to advertise it, I made a contribution to the Children's Hospital fund and to others here within my means, but most of my contributions go to drives that are made in Boston and Greater Boston and the State of Massachusetts. I am sure the same thing applies to all of you here. You contribute to the drives in your home community more than you might here in the District of Columbia. There are countless tens of thousands of Federal employees who make their contributions back home and not here in the District.

Furthermore, there are countless thousands of Federal employees who pay their income taxes elsewhere and because of that the District of Columbia, so far as income is concerned, is adversely affected.

Also, in connection with drives for funds, I want to point out there is very little manufacturing in the city of Washington and you know that in drives for funds for hospitals and for the Red Cross and so on and other community funds, the business establishments in the communities, particularly the manufacturing establishments, especially in relation to drives for new hospitals, make very large contributions because in case of injury the employees of the manufacturing establishments will receive the benefit of such new hospitals.

Of course, you and I know there are very few manufacturing establishments in the District of Columbia.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel the bill as reported out of committee, and well considered by the committee and by the District Commissioners, should be passed by the House, and I hope it will be passed.

I desire to emphasize strongly that this bill is applicable to the peculiar conditions that exist in the District of Columbia and has no application, and would not be applied, to any other place in our country. The unusual conditions existing in the Capital City of our country justifies the exception provided for in the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to proceed for an additional 1½ minutes.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am always reluctant to vote for appropriations for the District to be paid by the people of the States unless they are for a Federal as distinguished from a local activity and unless I think the expenditures are necessary. I expect to vote against this bill. I walked out in the lobby just a few moments ago and I happened to pick up this morning's Washington Post. In it I found an editorial which I will read:

OFFICER STANDARDS

The prompt disciplinary action announced by Army Secretary Frank Pace in the case

of Brig. Gen. David J. Crawford affords the best possible means of protecting the high standards required of an Army officer which the general so patently violated. There was nothing criminal in the general's conduct. So far as can be determined there was nothing that can even properly be called venal. One may, indeed, readily accept his own assertion that he was uninfluenced by the favors he received from a contractor doing business with the tank-automotive center he commanded. Secretary Pace declared that there was no evidence of contractual irregularities in General Crawford's handling of some \$6,000,000,000 of defense orders and described his work in organizing and developing the center as outstanding. Judgment of the general must be tempered, therefore, with regret that so promising a career has been wrecked on the shoals of indiscretion and impropriety.

General Crawford has now denied making the statement that he did nothing anybody else wouldn't have done. He is entitled to the benefit of the doubt. This reservation certainly does not apply, however, to the morally obtuse comment of Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, who said that the general was just doing what most of them do and got caught. It would be a lamentable state of affairs indeed if the Congressman were right in assuming that most officers do what General Crawford did.

Most officers, we are confident, respect the standard that those who serve the United States can no more properly receive special favors than they can grant them. General Crawford's disregard of this standard is the more surprising in that he is a West Pointer. The great prestige of that institution has been earned by almost uniform adherence to an exacting code of conduct—and by tough treatment of defections when they occur. Ethical standards are most in danger when responsible officials tend to express indifference to their breach. Secretary Pace's handling of the Crawford case suggests that, in the Army at least, the concept of an officer and a gentleman remains unchanged.

So I thought I should make a further inquiry about the bill. I assume, of course, that this bill provides for hospitalization of the people of the District of Columbia, as well as others?

Mr. O'HARA. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And it applies to mental cases?

Mr. O'HARA. I would say "Yes."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If that is true, then I think we should have some increased facilities here in the District of Columbia, especially to take care of those who are responsible for the editorial opinion expressed so often by the Washington Post, and who seem so often to have a mental quirk which is somewhat difficult for Midwest Americans to understand.

I recall—I have a very, very vivid recollection of the time some years ago—when the Washington Post fathered the persecution by subterfuge and fraud of some thirty-odd citizens of the United States. The Post caused them to be brought here from all over the country—some of them from as far away as 3,000 or more miles. In that group there were maybe four or five bad actors—people who had been convicted of criminal offenses. The rest were patriotic citizens with some sort of hobby or prejudice against one group or another.

The Post had them all brought down here. I think it was 4 years that they persecuted them here in Washington on

a false charge of sedition. The principal attorney, the Government attorney, who carried on the proceedings was one William Power Maloney, condemned several times by the Federal courts, including the United States Supreme Court, in fact the condemnation in effect was that he was a pettifogging shyster. He was finally arrested here in Washington for assault and battery on a Chinaman who was here I understood as a representative of his government. So you can see what the Post was then doing—it was by its own later admission engaged through trickery and fraud in attempting to silence those who were more opposed to the New Deal and communism. It has had a leftist red tinge for at least the last 10 years. If there ever was any fellow here in Washington accused of communism, who was not defended by the Washington Post, the Eugene Meyer paper, I do not know when or who it was. I do not recall any such instance. The Washington Post criticized, abused, and lied about the Dies committee which was attempting to expose communism. The Post finally apologized for the persecution of those thirty-odd people and said that it had no case and said in effect its alleged charge was a dirty, crooked deal. Their man who carried out the fraud was one Dillard Stokes, who went under an assumed name.

In this editorial referring to General Crawford, they say that the general said "he did nothing anybody else wouldn't have done." I understood the general to say just about what he is quoted as saying. He now denies that is what he said. But let it ride. Now, I attended the hearing. He said he had some trees, though they were white birch—turned out to be wild cherry—which he picked up in Michigan and hauled down to Maryland on an Army truck. Of course, that was wrong. He accepted an oak keel, worth about \$50, from some firm who had business with the Government. Of course that was wrong. Then he came down to the Congressional Hotel in Washington and while here on Government business accepted the hospitality of some friend who I think also had business with the Government. At the same time he drew a subsistence allowance from the Government.

Now, the general had done a remarkable job at Wayne. I made comment about that. The Post did not get the comment quite right. The Post says "this reservation certainly does not apply, however"—that is, the general's expression that most fellows are doing it—"this reservation does not apply, however, to the morally obtuse comment of Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, who said that the general was doing what most of them did but got caught." What I said was that many of them did it. If I had time I could show you thousands of Federal employees who do just exactly what the general did with reference to his entertainment at the Congressional Hotel. They get a subsistence allowance and take it even when they are being entertained. They are just that much to the good when someone else pays the

bill. For example, Congressmen can get a subsistence allowance of \$9 a day, as can some Federal employees, or we can put in our actual expenses and be repaid. Assuming, when I went to Detroit as a member of that committee, I went to the Book-Cadillac Hotel and there happened to be a friend of mine at the desk and he just put on my bill "Compliments of the hotel," and instead of paying my bill I used that slip and put the hotel bill into my expense bill to the committee and it was paid and not being out anything I took the money. Now, that would be stealing or fraudulently accepting money to which I was not entitled. I do not condone what the general did. What I was trying to do was to point out that it is customary for altogether too many Federal officials to pad their expense account and to accept funds to which they are not entitled, being the old traveling man's "swindle sheet," as it was called. We have all heard about that. I am wondering if those who are so bitter against the general have not sometimes done just that very thing. Mind you, I am not condoning what he did. He has paid, will pay a bitter price, and while he pays many higher-ups will escape detection and punishment. The President and the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, went up to Detroit the same week, to celebrate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Detroit. That was all right. Did they travel at Government expense? Of course they did. Was it a Government job they were on? No. They were up there as guests of Detroit—proper? Sure. Accepting hospitality of Detroit—again quite proper. But, incidentally, the President while on this Detroit trip, travel expenses paid by the United States, got in a few licks for his political friends, Senator Moovy and Governor Williams, both up for reelection in 1952. Is anybody kicking about it? Not that I have heard. And what about that across-the-country nonpolitical trip when the President was up for reelection?

I repeat, the general should not have done what he did. He should not have hauled those trees down to his Maryland home in an Army truck. He should not have taken that boat keel. He should not have let somebody pay his expenses and at the same time accept Government funds to reimburse himself for an item someone else bought. There is altogether too much spending of tax dollars on trips for items that are not properly chargeable to the Government. Why should we let General Vaughan and how many others, who are just profiting at Government expense, get away with it? Do not misunderstand me. One of the newspapers said, "Hoffman defends Crawford." I did not. I am not defending him for what he did. I am just calling attention to the fact that there is altogether too much of that petty, and sometimes not so petty, grafting by officials, some of whom are very, very high in official position, and no complaint is made about it. What about the recent trip of Secretary of Labor Tobin abroad and on which he is reported to have taken his wife? Page a Member of the

other body from Virginia if you wish to save tax dollars and cut down unethical spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the wording of the amendment which I offered, to strike out "line 21" and make it "line 4."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. KLEIN. That simply conforms to your amendment. The lines are different from what they are in the bill. It was 21 in the proposed bill but it happens to be line 4 in your amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can reach an agreement on closing debate on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] is recognized.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. The amendment that he has offered is attractive to a lot of Members, but the problem that we have is that there are not enough hospital facilities in the District; there is no Government agency or Government hospital district that can build the hospitals or will build them. The question in my mind if the gentleman's amendment should pass limiting our Government assistance merely to loans is whether the existing hospitals have expressed an opinion or a statement of any kind that they will accept the loan and expand their facilities.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The loan is not made to the hospital; in a sense it is given to the hospital, but it is to be paid back by the people of the District of Columbia. As the bill now reads the people of the District of Columbia will be required through taxes to be levied on them to pay back 30 percent of the amount. They have already recognized that the District has its responsibility, and they have gone so far as to say that we will pay you 30 percent of it; they have agreed to do that. That brings up the question: Is there any duty or responsibility on the National Government to give them the other 70 percent in addition to the grants that have heretofore been made to the hospitals in the District of Columbia?

There is about \$12,000,000 that would be available. They agreed to pay back 30 percent of it. Our amendment simply provides that they shall pay it all back, and if they paid it back over a

period of 25 years that would be approximately \$500,000 a year. That is all.

Mr. WERDEL. I say again that the problem in my mind and in that of many other Members is that these private organizations that have these hospitals are in a peculiar area where people are transient; they do not support those organizations like they do in other parts of the country. Do they represent the only hospital facilities we have in the District? Do we have any Government agency that will build hospitals?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon; they do not represent the only hospital facilities we have in the District of Columbia by any manner of means; this is a minority group of hospitals.

Mr. WERDEL. The real point to which I wish the gentleman to reply is: Have the hospitals expressed the intention to use the gentleman's amendment to provide the expanded facilities that we all admit are needed?

Mr. ABERNETHY. There is no obligation on the part of the hospitals in either instance in these bills; there is no obligation whatsoever on the part of the hospital to do anything except to pay for half of it themselves. They do that under either bill. There will be no obligation on the part of the hospital to do anything other than that if the committee bill passes, and there will be no obligation on the part of the hospital to pay the whole sum if either bill passes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that the weakness of the argument of my friend from Mississippi is that under the present hospital-center bill this very formula except in general language exists: The District pays 30 percent or 50 percent. This bill under consideration specifies definitely how they pay it back.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would be applicable to these hospitals—the remaining \$12,000,000. A different situation exists with reference to these hospitals than does with reference to the three hospitals that constitute the hospital center now. All we are doing in this bill is to provide in substance the same contribution in respect to the remaining \$12,000,000 as has already been made in the case of the three hospitals.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. And which are getting \$23,000,000 of the fund.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There is a good reason for what the gentleman has just said with regard to the distinction between the two groups of hospitals—the private hospitals and the public hospitals; there is good reason for it. The grant under the hospital center is given to public hospitals; they are public hospitals that will be operated as a Federal

institution—as a hospital center. There is where the difference is.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some difference of opinion relative to what happens to these three hospitals. I think it should be made clear that the three hospitals which will go into the center, if and when it is formed, are the Emergency, Garfield, and Episcopal hospitals. They are going into the hospital center. When they go in they give up all of their property to the District of Columbia. When they go to the Hospital Center they become public institutions run as Federal institutions in the District of Columbia. So these three hospitals, Emergency, Garfield, and Episcopal, when they go into the hospital center will lose their identity and their property worth millions of dollars is given over to the District of Columbia. The other hospitals that want to go in, that we are providing the money for, are Providence, Casualty, Sibley, Homeopathic, perhaps Columbia, not the Doctors Hospital because they say they make a little money.

We talk about these hospitals being nonprofit hospitals. Let me say to you, all you need to do is to look at their financial statements to see whether they are nonprofit or not. Of course, they use their funds for a good thing, and I am for them. But they charge \$16 for every patient-day you are in those hospitals on the average. They are making some money. These hospitals have agreed to give back 50 percent and all we are trying to do in this bill is to say to the District of Columbia and the people of the District of Columbia, "You tax yourselves to pay back this loan without interest."

We have not been stingy with the District of Columbia because 70 percent of the funds, amounting to many millions, went into Georgetown and George Washington University hospitals, 70 percent Federal money taken from the taxpayers. We gave every penny to the Freedmen's Hospital, a fine Negro hospital. It is worthy, it is justified. All we are asking is that the hospitals that come in under this bill, and there is one hospital that is ready to come in, put up their 50 percent. They are going to put up their money and all we are asking is that the District put up its funds and pay back 50 percent in 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reply to a statement made by the majority leader. On April 28, 1948, we had hearings in committee. May I say to the majority leader that we had the bill before my committee and while I did report the bill out, the committee was divided and I said this, after discussion with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], and the chairman:

Suppose we report out the three bills favorably, including the hospital bill, but no action on the hospital bill, and leave it up to the full committee to decide.

The full committee by a one-vote margin reported the bill out on May 6, 1948. The gentleman who is now speaking did not support the bill but as chairman of the committee I was delegated to make the report. I did not support the original hospital bill, nor did I support the 1948 bill except to report same.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has referred twice to the Providence Hospital being a fine Catholic hospital. But there is a fine Methodist hospital to be included also.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I make this statement without any passion, and I hope I will not be misunderstood: I do not think it is wise for an Episcopalian, Methodist, or Catholic hospital to dig into the pockets of the taxpayers of the people of the Nation and say, "Here, we want some money to build a hospital." What does it do to their drives for money? The Children's Hospital has raised \$1,500,000 by public subscriptions. Do you think that would go on, with public subscriptions, if these organizations can go to the taxpayers instead and get money? Of course they would not. Why do you not do the sensible thing about this. If you do this for the District of Columbia you should do it for every State in the Union, and that is the answer. The principle is wrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my home town we have had, as I recall, three hospital drives running over the past 5 years where private individuals have paid their subscriptions. Just a few weeks ago we opened a great Lutheran hospital, paid for by private funds. I agree with the gentleman that the religious organizations should not come to the Federal Government to raise funds to build hospitals.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It was wrong in principle.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Miller-Abernethy amendment to this bill.

That is a rather shrewd move and a good move for those who are in opposition to this legislation. It confuses the situation thoroughly. It presents to you a bill that has never been considered by a committee, has never been even read to you, and as far as I know, nobody ever read it but the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Now, I think the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let me say this. The gentleman directed his remarks to me. The amendment was being read and I asked unanimous consent that fur-

ther reading be dispensed with, and the gentleman had a right to object.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And I did not object.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I know the gentleman did not object.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; and I do not yield further because my time is limited. I did not object, no; I wanted it to be in just exactly the position that it is in. Here comes a brand new bill offered to you gentlemen that, so far as I know, and I repeat my statement, has never been seen or read by anybody but the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]. Now, those gentlemen are opposed to the bill. I see a good deal of merit in that position, coming as they do from distant points, and I do not blame them for being opposed to it. That is their privilege and that is their right, but the fact is that this is a move to kill the bill. If you want to kill the bill, let us vote down this amendment that none of you know what is in it, and I do not know what is in it, except that verbal explanation. If you want to vote down the bill, vote down the amendment, and then if you want to vote down the bill, vote it down, and let us approach it in the direct way.

Here is the situation that I am afraid we so often do not realize here in the House of Representatives. That the District of Columbia is entirely a different proposition from the rest of the country. This is a Federal city. This is a city where it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that there are the proper facilities here not only for the residents, but for the Government employees and for the thousands and thousands of visitors that come here. Now, you say the Federal Government ought not to pay for it. Why, my friends, these hospitals which have been built voluntarily, which are run from charitable instincts and do the charitable work of hospitals in this city, do it not for the residents of the District of Columbia alone; they do it for your constituents and mine. You can look in these galleries now or any day you want to, you can walk out into these corridors any day you want to, and you will see hundreds and maybe thousands of your constituents and my constituents who come here as visitors and as tourists. They fall down and break a leg; they get into an automobile accident, and these charitable hospitals, whether they are religious or nonreligious, take care of them, and if they cannot pay the bill it is charged up to the general fund. Now, these hospitals are old hospitals. They have been in existence, some of them, for 30 or 40 years. Many of them are not fit for people to be in because of the danger of fire and other hazards. Something has to be done about it. We are presented with a practical proposition here. This committee has given this matter the most serious consideration. We have considered it over the years. The District Committee comes in here and says to you that this in our judgment is the thing to do and the best

thing to do. We do hope that this House will have sufficient confidence in the District Committee to go along with us on this proposition.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. I hope the gentleman will also agree with me that the newspapers of Washington should give us some credit if we pass this bill for doing something for the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. A vain hope.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 19, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The first section of such act of August 7, 1946, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) To make grants to private agencies in cash, or in land or other property (which the Administrator is hereby authorized to acquire for such purpose by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise) upon such terms and in such amounts or of such value as the Administrator may deem to be in the public interest to enable such private agencies to make surveys and investigations, to plan, design, construct, remodel, relocate, rebuild, renovate, extend, equip, furnish, or repair hospital facilities in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That in no event shall the amount or value of the grant exceed 50 percent of the value of the hospital plant of a private agency as improved with the aid of such grant: *Provided further*, That, except in the case of the construction and equipment of a new hospital, no such grant shall be made to any private agency unless such private agency shall obligate itself to pay at least 50 percent of the cost of any project for which such grant is made. As used in this act the term 'private agencies' shall mean any nonprofit private agencies operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. The fifth section of such act of August 7, 1946, is amended by striking from the first sentence thereof the words "at such times and in such amounts, without interest", as the Congress shall hereafter determine", and by inserting in lieu thereof "at the annual rate, without interest of 3 percent of such 80 percent."

SEC. 4. The title of such act of August 7, 1946, is amended to read as follows: An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities to private agencies in the District of Columbia, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be

printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN: On page 2, line 21, after the word "agencies", insert the words "either now or in the future."

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take much of the time of the Committee because this is exactly the same amendment as I offered previously. I am very sorry the gentleman from Massachusetts took occasion to object to it. As he knows, I discussed this amendment with both sides and with the gentleman himself, because he is the author of this bill. I did not think there was any objection to it. I venture to say that neither did he at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will agree that I did not say I would accept it. Is not that true, in all frankness, now?

Mr. KLEIN. In all fairness, that is true, but neither did the gentleman say he was objecting to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman and I have had very, very few differences. I am very sorry that he takes this position, because I feel if we had been cognizant of this in the committee, this provision would have been in the bill and no one would have objected.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In view of the situation and the action just taken by the committee, I will support the gentleman's amendment. My reason for that is that we started this program with a hospital center and a hospital center only. Then the private hospitals attempted to come in under the bill, and they failed. It appears now that they are going to succeed. I am quite sure that in a year or two if there are other private hospitals that do not get in under the bill, we will have another bill here to bring them in. I think we might as well include all future private hospitals and let the gentleman and his friends come in. I think it is only fair that they do.

Mr. KLEIN. It is particularly fair because this is not in the too distant future. As I understand it, this group is presently about to be formed and these doctors have already formed this association, the purpose of which will be to come in under this plan. I insist that it is merely an oversight, and that if it had been thought of in committee, it would be in the bill now. I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts would withdraw his objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Beginning on page 2, line 24, strike out everything down through page 3, line 3, and insert the following: "Is amended to read as follows: 'Section 5. The total amount expended by the Federal Works Administrator under this act shall be repaid to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia within 25 years without interest.'"

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, since the committee has taken the action it has in admitting these institutions, it seems to me only fair that my colleagues should know the amendment here simply requires the Commissioners to pay back the funds over a period of 25 years without interest.

I point that out because under the Hill-Burton Act they are getting funds now; \$1,350,000 came to the District under the Hill-Burton bill. More moneys will be coming. I refer to the metropolitan area and I call your attention to the figures in Maryland. Maryland, with a population of 2,343,000 has received \$4,177,000 under the Hill-Burton bill. Virginia, that is also a part of the metropolitan area, with a population of three and one-third millions received \$10,670,000. So that the total amount is a part of the funds received in the metropolitan area. It does seem to me we are establishing a dangerous policy for the District of Columbia.

I say this with a great deal of reflection, that if you do this for the District of Columbia, then you should do it for the States throughout the Nation. Then you will be on the road toward making these fine institutions that have gone out and gotten public subscriptions and been supported by the community no longer desirous of raising funds. They will no longer have the desire or the necessity, if I may say, of going out and asking the people of the community to support the hospital or other institutions, because they know then they may be able to come to the Treasurer and put their hands into the tax pocket of the people. Here in Congress we are going to support that. That is what you are doing.

I do not want to hear any more economy cries on my side of the House, when they are setting up a new policy here which permits religious organizations to come to the Federal Treasurer for handouts. It is one of those things that you are starting which is entirely new. It is a change in policy. Under the amendment it simply requires, as we would do in our own towns and counties and cities, at home, to say to the city commissioners, or the county officials, "This money has to be paid back," except that we are a little more liberal here. We say, "You do not have to pay any interest over 25 years."

We say, "You do not have to pay any interest."

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understood we voted a minute ago to close debate on all amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. That applied to the pending amendment and amendments thereto.

Mr. MORANO. I thought we closed debate on the bill and only permitted amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion was to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The District has a surplus of over \$2,000,000. Of course, the Federal Government has gone into helping people all over the country—waterworks, sewage-disposal plants, libraries, and public construction. It is becoming the habit for municipalities to get their foot into the door of the Treasury. This is another foot in the door of the Treasury that is going to permit private hospitals and institutions all over the country to do the same thing. If we adopt this for the District of Columbia we should adopt it for the Nation.

I think it is a bad policy, and I offered the amendment with the hope that the House might adopt it in order to say to the District population and the District Commissioners that these grants should be paid back over a period of 25 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has offered in the form of an amendment the same amendment, or substantially the same amendment, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] offered in the nature of a substitute. The Committee of the Whole voted on this same amendment a few minutes ago and it defeated the substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Might I emphasize as strongly as possible, so there will be no misunderstanding in the minds of any of my colleagues or in the RECORD, that this situation is peculiar to the District of Columbia. It has no application to any other part of the Nation. The fear about legislation of this kind applying to the rest of the Nation has no justification and would receive my opposition. These unusual circumstances within the District of Columbia, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] so eloquently stated, from a practical angle justify it. I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House

with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DEMPSEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 144]

Armstrong	Fernandez	Pickett
Bakewell	Fisher	Poage
Baring	Gamble	Poulson
Barrett	Gillette	Powell
Bates, Mass.	Golden	Rabaut
Blatnick	Gossett	Ramsay
Boggs, La.	Hall	Redden
Bosone	Edwin Arthur	Regan
Breen	Hand	Rogers, Colo.
Brehm	Hébert	Saylor
Buckley	Hedrick	Scott, Hardie
Busbey	Irving	Scott,
Camp	Javits	Hugh D., Jr.
Case	Kennedy	Scrivner
Celler	Kerr	Sheppard
Chatham	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Chenoweth	Kilburn	Sikes
Cooley	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Coudert	Lyle	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Taber
Dawson	Machrowicz	Teague
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Thomas
Dollinger	Morgan	Vinson
Doyle	Morton	Vursell
Durham	Moulder	Watts
Eberhart	Murray, Tenn.	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.	Winstead
Elston	O'Neill	Wood, Ga.
Engle	Perkins	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL CENTER AND FACILITIES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 2094) to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to report the same back forthwith, with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia,' approved August 7, 1946, is amended by striking out 'acquire land and construct buildings' and inserting in lieu thereof 'acquire land, construct buildings, and make loans to private agencies.'"

"Sec. 2. The first section of such act of August 7, 1946, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) to make loans to private agencies to enable such private agencies to make surveys and investigations, to plan, design, construct, remodel, relocate, rebuild, renovate, extend, equip, furnish, or repair hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. Each such loan made under this subsection shall be charged against the District of Columbia and shall be repaid in full to the Federal Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in equal annual installments, without interest over a period of not more than 25 years: *Provided*, That in no event shall the amount or value of the loan exceed 50 percent of the value of the hospital plant of a private agency as improved with the aid of such loan: *Provided further*, That, except in the case of the construction and equipment of a new hospital, no such loan shall be made to any private agency unless such private agency shall obligate itself to pay at least 50 percent of the cost of any project for which such loan is made.

As used in this act, the term "private agencies" shall mean any nonprofit private agency operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia."

"Sec. 3. The fifth section of such act of August 7, 1946, is amended (1) by inserting '(except subsec. (c) of the first section)' after 'act' the first time it appears therein and (2) by striking from the first sentence thereof the words 'at such times and in such amounts, without interest, as the Congress shall hereafter determine', and by inserting in lieu thereof 'at the annual rate, without interest, of 3 percent of such 30 percent.'"

"Sec. 4. The title of such act of August 7, 1946, is amended to read as follows: 'An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, to authorize the making of loans for hospital facilities to private agencies in the District of Columbia to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.'"

"Amend the title so as to read, 'A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of loans for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I believe the majority leader asked for the yeas and nays on the previous question. I desire to have a vote on the passage of the bill and on the motion to recommit. Is it in order to ask for tellers on the vote on the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. We have not reached that point yet.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On that I ask for tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. McMILLAN and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

The question was taken; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 103, noes 153.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN ALLOTTED LAND ON THE BLACKFEET RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 629) to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "Bonds" over to and including "purchaser", in line 9 on page 2.

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Blackfeet Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and such notice, together with a description of the lands, and an offer by the owner thereof to sell such lands upon the terms specified in such notice to the Blackfeet Tribe or any member thereof, shall have been posted for such period of time in a conspicuous public place at such agency, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Blackfeet Tribe or any member thereof and reported to the Superintendent of the Blackfeet Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Blackfeet Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was given and posted in accordance with the provisions of clause

(1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection shall, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated, be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section.

"(c) That, if the land is purchased by the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof, title shall be conveyed by deed to the United States in trust for the purchaser, and if the land is purchased by a non-Indian a patent in fee shall be issued to the purchaser."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the Senate amendments are?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the only purpose of the amendment is to give preference right in the purchase of this land to a member of or to the tribe of Blackfeet Indians.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They live on the reservation at the present time, do they?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 503 (B) OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3298) to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will bring up for consideration H. R. 3298 introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. It is fully explained in a very excellent report submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The bill has two specific aims:

First. It strengthens the protection of the public health against dangerous

abuses in the sale of potent drugs without prescriptions.

Second. It relieves the public and retail druggists from unnecessary restrictions on dispensing of drugs which can be used safely without medical supervision.

I think that it is a bill to protect the public health and also a bill for the relief of more than 80,000 pharmacists in the Nation's 47,000 drug stores who fill nearly 600,000,000 prescriptions every year. These professional men perform a most important service and should be assisted in that service to the extent possible through wise legislation.

Retail druggists and manufacturers agree that most of the provisions of the bill are not controversial. The present Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in section 503 (b) recognizes only "a written prescription signed by a physician, dentist, or veterinarian." This is unnecessarily burdensome on both the public and the druggist. The evidence is conclusive that good medical practice today requires the use of the telephone in prescribing medicines. Under appropriate safeguards a pharmacist should be allowed to fill and refill prescriptions when the physician authorizes him to do so by telephone.

The present law does not authorize pharmacists to refill any prescription without the written authorization of the doctor. This is unrealistic. House bill 3298 will permit the refilling without restriction of prescriptions for drugs that can safely be taken by a layman without medical supervision. But the bill requires that before a prescription for a habit-forming drug, a dangerous drug, a drug that is otherwise unsuitable for use by a layman, or a new drug that is limited to professional use can be refilled the doctor must be consulted and his authority obtained. Everyone concerned agrees with these provisions.

A regulation under the present law divides drugs into two classes:

First, drugs that are not suitable for use except under the supervision of a physician; and second, drugs which are suitable for use by laymen in self-medication.

The present law and the regulation has not accomplished its objective. The practical result has been that retail pharmacists have on their shelves the same drug manufactured by different firms and with different labels. When the product bears the statement: "Caution: To be dispensed only by or on the prescription of a physician," the druggist may not sell it without a prescription. The same product, however, in a package bearing directions for use may be sold without a prescription. When this situation is repeated many times in the case of different drugs it brings about confusion which affects both the public and the pharmacist. The bill is designed to end this confusion.

The means chosen to divide drugs into two classes: First, prescription drugs; second, drugs for over-the-counter sale, is controversial. The retail druggists urge that there be one authority empowered to propose a list of drugs for prescription sale only. If no one objects the list would be promulgated without

force and effect of law. If objection is raised the Administrator would be required to announce and subsequently hold a public hearing. The druggists say that the Food and Drug Administration, under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency, is the logical governmental authority to prepare the prescription list. No alternative agency has been suggested.

The purpose of the hearing would be to receive the testimony of experts qualified by scientific training and experience. The expert testimony would deal with the question of whether or not the drug could be safely used without medical supervision including the question of whether or not the drug is one that the layman can use without medical supervision as an effective weapon against his disease. In other words, whether or not he could be told by directions how to regulate the dosage in relation to temperature or other symptoms and thus make effective use of the drug. The Administrator would be required to base his decision solely on the evidence taken at the hearing and judicial review comparable to that provided in the Administrative Procedure Act would be available to any interested person.

Testimony before the Rules Committee was to the effect that drug manufacturers opposed this delegation of power. They prefer to have the list made by individual lawsuits brought in the Federal courts. Testimony was presented that this case-by-case method of judicial determination would unnecessarily and unfairly involve retail druggists in court proceedings. These would need to be brought against retail pharmacists to determine what drugs should be restricted to prescription sale and what drugs could be sold over the counter. The druggist wants to know in advance what drugs he can properly sell without prescription. He does not want to be subjected to expensive litigation to determine how he must dispense each drug.

The real issue for the Congress to decide is whether as a matter of public policy it is best to decide before a man subjects himself to criminal prosecution whether a drug which he manufactures or sells in his drug store should be sold on prescription or can be sold over the counter.

The manufacturer argues that it would be better to accept the risk of criminal prosecution than to authorize in advance administrative determination even though that determination were controlled by statutory standard and subject to procedures comparable to those set forth in the Administrative Procedure Act. The Rules Committee felt that with a division of 19 to 4 in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that this issue is an appropriate one for settlement through debate on the floor and, therefore, recommends an open rule allowing 2 hours of debate.

In view of the fact that there is controversy as to this legislation, may I read into the RECORD some letters and telegrams which correctly indicate the approval of this legislation on the part of both retail druggists and the College

of Pharmacy faculty in the State of Washington:

SEATTLE, WASH., July 19, 1951.
Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL,
New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 3298 is necessary to avoid much confusion now existing in the dispensing of prescriptions. At the same time it will cut the cost of medication to the patient. This bill has been studied by the association and has its unanimous consent. Will appreciate your efforts in its passage.

R. E. DUCKERING,
Executive Secretary, Seattle-King
County Retail Druggists Association.

SEATTLE, WASH., July 19, 1951.
Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Pharmacists of Washington in convention in Yakima unanimously endorsed Durham-Humphrey bill. Evasion of responsibilities on the part of drug manufacturers in proper labeling, plus stupid regulations now prevailing, make for unnecessary burden and expense to both pharmacists and patients. Freedom to pharmacists to accept medical orders by telephone for nondangerous drugs would cut medical expense to the public. Your leadership in helping pilot this bill from committee and through the House would be appreciated by pharmacists and public alike throughout the State.

GRAHAM A. CONDIE.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,
Seattle, Wash., July 18, 1951.
Congressman HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MITCHELL: I am writing to you with a sincere hope that you will give favorable consideration to H. R. 3298 (the Durham-Humphrey bill).

Although I am not a practicing pharmacist, I am deeply interested in promoting the best interests of pharmacy and the pharmacists. This bill definitely is a benefit to the pharmacist, the physician, and the public at large and is certainly consistent with the best practice of pharmacy. The pharmacists are striving to render the best public health service consistent with the profession, and I am sure that the passage of this bill will favor this service. Even the young people who are graduating from our colleges of pharmacy in general are looking to our representatives in Congress to assist in this important matter.

Any consideration that you will give in bringing this bill before the committee and in accomplishing its successful passage will be appreciated.

Very sincerely,

FOREST J. GOODRICH, Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,
Seattle, Wash., July 18, 1951.
Congressman HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MITCHELL: I am writing to you to ask your support for H. R. 3298 (the Durham-Humphrey bill).

I feel that this bill is in the best interests of the profession of pharmacy and the public as well. Since the pharmacists are striving to render the best public-health service possible, I am sure that the passage of this bill will favor this service.

Any consideration that you may give in bringing this bill before the committee will be considered a great service by all who are interested in pharmacy.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS FISCHER,
Professor of Pharmaceutical Chemistry.

WASHINGTON STATE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Seattle, July 18, 1951.
Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I received word that the Durham bill, H. R. 3298, is now in the rules committee, after receiving favorable action during a public hearing in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This bill is a needed amendment to the Federal Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act, and has an endorsement of the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration.

It outlines the proper procedure that the pharmacist must follow in refilling of prescriptions and also legalizes telephoning of prescriptions from the physician, which is so necessary under the present conditions of medical care for the general public.

This bill has the unanimous endorsement of the members of our Association and I respectfully request that you use your influence to see that this bill comes out on the floor.

Respectfully yours,

H. E. HENDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that if the Administrator decided that some of these popular headache tablets that are advertised, and that are quite effective, could only be secured on prescription, it would be necessary for an individual to go to a doctor and get a prescription before he could buy these headache tablets?

Mr. MITCHELL. If he should decide that on the basis of the legislative standards set up in this bill and were upheld by the board of experts, I presume that would be true.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the evidence disclosed that this is in the interest of the thousands of druggists, that it would eliminate their trouble and annoyance, and at the same time benefit the public, so that they would not be obliged to get a duplicate prescription from a doctor and pay a double fee, or sometimes a triple fee, to get a prescription filled out, when the product could be sold without a new prescription from the doctor?

Mr. MITCHELL. My chairman is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In response to the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota, if he will read the bill he will find in it this language, which I believe answers his question. The Administrator shall base his determination—and I quote now from the bill—"on the basis of opinions generally held among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and efficacy of such drug."

In my opinion, and apparently in the opinion of the committee, that eliminates the danger of any arbitrary mis-

use of the authority to do this by the Administrator.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I regret to say to the gentleman that I do not have a great deal of confidence in the present Administrator. He may do most anything in spite of expert opinion.

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman understands that the Food and Drug Administration reaches the conclusions, which are just acted upon by the Administrator. There has been no complaint against the Food and Drug Administration on its administration of similar provisions regarding habit-forming drugs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have had considerable experience with the Food and Drug Administration during the past 18 years. Some of the actions they have taken have been absolutely arbitrary and contrary to the recommendations of the experts.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. If this bill becomes law, would it affect patent medicines and household remedies that have been customarily sold by rural stores and in suburban areas back through the years? Would those drugs have to be approved by the Administration before they could be sold?

Mr. MITCHELL. In my opinion they would not be affected.

Mr. BONNER. I want that to be clear. The gentleman says in his opinion they would not.

Mr. O'HARA. Wait a minute; that is completely wrong.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is my understanding that rural stores that have sold proprietary medicines can continue to do so under this bill. Is that the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. MITCHELL. The board of experts would have to reach a conclusion on whether these remedies fall within the outlined categories.

Mr. SPRINGER. That has been formerly governed by State law, has it not?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will have to refer that to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Unless these drugs should come within this category, that is the category within the definition of subsection (B) of section (b) of this bill, which defines a dangerous drug or a prescription drug as follows:

(B) because of its toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effect, or the method of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its use, has been determined by the Administrator, on the basis of opinions generally held among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and efficacy of such drug (and, where a public hearing is required by paragraph (5), on the basis of evidence adduced at such hearing by such experts), to be safe and efficacious for use only after professional diagnosis by, or under the supervision of, a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug.

Unless it comes within that standard, the drug can be sold over the counter.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not true, then, under this bill that you are transferring these proprietary medicines which formerly have been sold, as the gentleman from North Carolina has described, by rural grocery stores to the situation where now it is going to be determined by this Administrator as to how they shall be sold? Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is stated in the law. Unless they are dangerous drugs the Administrator does not put them on his list. It will not affect the sale of Watkins products, for instance, and various other products.

Mr. O'HARA. May I make a statement in regard to a question of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. BONNER. I do not think the question has ever been answered.

Mr. O'HARA. No; it has not. I will say to the gentleman, frankly, there are about 30,000 drug items, including these so-called patent medicines that under this bill are going to be turned over to Mr. Oscar Ewing, as Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Security Agency, and he will then be charged with making the decision of whether they must be prescription drugs, or over-the-counter items, such as patent medicines.

Mr. BONNER. I asked the gentleman from Washington whether all these different drugs and all these patent medicines have to be taken up item by item to determine whether or not they could be sold in the customary manner as they have been in the past.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. They do not have to be taken up by the Administrator to determine their status on an individual basis. For instance, there are several hundred types of aspirins which I am sure the gentleman includes in that category that he mentioned of drugs being sold over the counter. The Administrator would not have to take each one of those types of aspirins and make that determination. Those which, by virtue of long tradition and custom are considered to be safe over-the-counter drugs would not be affected whatsoever.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Mississippi just read about alcoholic contents. I asked the gentleman and he read from the bill about alcoholic contents; did he not?

Mr. HARRIS. No; the gentleman read from the bill the standard which was set up.

Mr. BONNER. Just to name a specific drug that has become very popular, consider this drug Hadacol. Will people have to go to doctors to get a prescription for Hadacol?

Mr. HARRIS. No; Hadacol would not be affected. It would not come under this at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee states:

Under this standard a drug will be adjudged a prescription drug if because of its toxicity or any other potentiality for harm-

ful effect, or the method of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its use, it is unsafe or inefficacious for use without professional supervision.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to read a telegram I received from Mr. H. E. Henderson, the executive secretary of the Washington State Pharmaceutical Association:

SEATTLE, WASH., July 18, 1951.
Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The druggists of this State, being entirely familiar with the provisions of H. R. 3298, urgently request that you use your efforts to secure favorable passage of this measure. We in our association have discussed it and are familiar with all of its ramifications.

This telegram was sent following a telephone conversation in which I pointed out that some were contending that pharmacists did not understand the amended bill.

The faculty of the College of Pharmacy of the University of Washington has written me to the same effect. They feel this legislation is necessary to straighten out the problems in the drug industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H. R. 3298, a bill designed to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It is an open rule and if adopted provides for 2 hours of general debate after which it is open to amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The primary purpose of this bill is to correct the uncertainty in the present law regarding druggists refilling prescriptions. The Food and Drug Administration has announced that under the present law a druggist may not fill an oral prescription or refill a written prescription unless specifically authorized by the prescribing physician. H. R. 3298 permits the use of oral prescriptions in the case of all drugs. However, in the case of habit-forming drugs, an oral prescription would have to be reduced promptly to writing and filled by a druggist. This is the part that retail druggists desire, and as far as I have been able to ascertain there is no objection.

All opposition to this bill centers around the extraordinary powers proposed to be granted to Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing. If this bill is not amended, Oscar Ewing will have the power under this bill to determine what drugs will be sold; and, if they are permitted to be sold, whether or not they will be sold over the counter or upon prescriptions. This is the same Oscar Ewing who is the original sponsor of socialized medicine, as well as a recent advocate of free medical aid for persons over 65 years of age. In my opinion, this is an unjustifiable delegation of power to an administrative agency. That is the reason I have received scores of communications from members of the medical profession back home opposing

paragraph B which grants Oscar Ewing all this power.

I am of the belief that Congress has already delegated too much authority to departments and agencies and the further delegation of power tending to the socialization of pharmacy, dentistry, nursing, and medicine merits our most serious consideration.

Since I have been in Congress I have continually opposed the granting of excessive powers to bureaucrats. A review of the legislation proposed by Oscar Ewing clearly shows that he is a confirmed adherent to the socialization of many of our institutions and professions. That is the reason the doctors in our districts are opposed to paragraph B. That is the reason various State pharmaceutical associations are opposed to paragraph B. That is the reason the national medical association is opposed to paragraph B.

All opposition to this bill would be eliminated if paragraph B is eliminated. This can be done if paragraph B is stricken and in lieu thereof the following be substituted:

(B) Because of its toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effect or the method of its use or the collateral measures necessary to its use is not safe for use except by or under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug.

I understand such an amendment is to be offered by a member of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not just at this moment.

The reason there is so much controversy about this bill is that the retail druggists are for the part of the bill which permits refills. They have sent many telegrams to Members of this House. We are all agreed about that. On the other hand, the American Medical Association have sent telegrams opposing paragraph B. I have received many telegrams from my local doctors back home who are dealing directly with the druggists. I believe they are all opposed to paragraph B.

I have a telegram from the American Medical Association. They oppose paragraph B. They say:

American Medical Association wishes to advise that it filed statement at close of hearings opposing H. R. 3298 which unfortunately was not printed with hearings. Association favored original Durham bill relating to refilling prescriptions but objects very definitely to later addition which would give Federal Security Administrator power to determine therapeutic value of drugs. Such authority should remain with physicians and pharmacists if public interest is to be respected. This provision gives Federal Security Administrator unnecessary and unwarranted power to regulate the dispensing of drugs.

Then, I have one from the National Pharmaceutical Association. These people are druggists. They say:

Difference between various groups and drug industry on proposed form of H. R. 3298 will be considered at annual convention and request you to withhold action until our association of 25,000 members can give consideration to the revised bill.

Mention has been made today of proprietary medicine sold in country stores and drug stores, mentioned, I believe, by the gentleman from North Carolina, asking whether the Administrator would be given the power to determine what drugs and medicine could be sold over the counter in drug stores if section (b) of this bill is adopted.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I am not talking about country drug stores; I am talking about country stores that have been selling patent medicines, household remedies, for years. I want to know whether one man is going to be given the power to decide whether or not such medicine and remedies can be sold only by a doctor's prescription, whether a man has got to go to a doctor to get a dose of Bromo-Seltzer.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that that is my understanding. Under this bill as presently written Mr. Ewing would determine which ones would come under prescription. It is an exaggeration, but he could go so far as to require a prescription for milk of magnesia or for aspirin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the strange wording of paragraph (b). It does not say "which has been determined by the Administrator to be safe and efficacious;" it says "has been determined by the Administrator on the basis of opinion generally held among experts qualified by scientific training and experience."

I say that with such attitude as that the Administrative Procedure Act would not control the Administrator at all.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Has the gentleman any idea as to whether an amendment will be offered to delete that section from the bill, and if so, will it emasculate the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understand such an amendment will be offered. If the committee does not offer it I will offer it myself, which will bring the bill into conformity with the wishes of the drug stores back home as to the provisions regarding refilling, but which will take away from this Oscar Ewing the power to issue orders and regulations affecting drugs and medicine.

Mr. MORANO. I want to vote for such an amendment but I also want to vote for a bill that will enable the druggist to refill prescriptions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman; I feel the same way about it and I think a great majority of the Members of the House feel as we do.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. On this question raised by the gentleman from North Carolina, under the provisions of

the bill the authority to do the thing he fears might be done is there. How far the Administrator will exercise his authority, of course, is not known. As has been pointed out there are 30,000 drugs. This is about the mechanics of the situation: The Federal Security Administrator if he decided, let us say, to put Bromo-Seltzer on the prescription list, a thing which has been sold over the counter for years, he would have three, four, or five experts testify that in their opinion it was a dangerous drug, not safe or efficacious to be sold over the counter at drug stores. The drug industry would present experts who would testify to the contrary. Then there would be a conflict of medical opinion and the final authority under the decision as to whether or not the sale of the drug should be by prescription or over the counter would lie with the Administrator. He would have final arbitrary authority. That is one of the principal objections to that section.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his usual sound logic and reasoning.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. My distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] inquired of the Administrator, Mr. Ewing, when he testified in connection with this bill as to aspirin, and this is what Mr. Ewing said:

Well, as of today, I would say "No"—

Whether it would have to be on the list—

but I think you have to recognize that under this bill you might have an Administrator who would call a hearing to put aspirin on the list of dangerous drugs. If he held that aspirin was a dangerous drug and that was appealed to the circuit court of appeals and they upheld it, then you would be in that situation.

Mr. Ewing frankly says that is the situation under this bill. Let me say that you have in that connection on appeal the language of the Food and Drug Act which says in effect that if the opinion, the judgment, of the Administrator is supported by substantial evidence, which means practically any evidence, the Circuit Court of Appeals has to affirm that decision. So what we have is a tremendous power given to one man to make a decision that is all important to the people in your community and mine.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should say, in response to the statement read by my distinguished colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] that the statement of the Administrator referred to the original Durham bill which did give the Administrator unlimited authority to go as far as he wanted to; but since then the committee wrote into the bill the standards that are set up here, which would, of course, limit the administrative authority to make such a far-reaching determination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course, I agree with my distinguished friend from Arkansas, but in response to what the gentleman from Michigan said a few minutes ago about putting aspirin on this list, I may say that the committee heard and went over all of these arguments. Amendments were offered, amendments were voted on, and the committee voted by a vote of 19 to 4 to include the language that is contained in this bill, with the administrative list and with an administrative and judicial review. If the Administrator should act arbitrarily, and place such an innocuous drug as aspirin on this list, and I am going to read from the bill:

Any interested person may file with the Administrator a petition proposing the making of a determination, or the modification of a determination made or proposed to be made, by the Administrator pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1). The filing of a petition for the purpose of opposing a proposed determination that a drug is one to which such paragraph (B) applies shall stay the operation of paragraph (1) with respect to such drug until a petition for judicial review can be filed and interim relief sought under section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the decision of the Administrator supersede State laws in regard to the refilling of prescriptions? It would certainly be very dangerous if a prescription for the derivatives of phenobarbital could be refilled in the States that have laws preventing the refilling of a doctor's prescription without the physician's order. Here in Washington there have been a number of suicides that have taken place as a result of overdoses of barbiturates. People get a dual personality, and also as a result of that medicine their hearts become very much weakened. I think the Senate will pass a companion bill to one I have introduced and now pending before the Ways and Means Committee which will rectify and control that situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts can allay her fears with regard to State laws conflicting with the Federal laws in this respect. If the State laws prohibit the refilling of phenobarbital prescriptions, that will be prevented.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We should have a national law, because the States are not enacting these laws. I know the gentleman remembers some cases of suicide as the result of an overdose of phenobarbital.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I have here scores and scores of telegrams objecting to paragraph (b) which gives Mr. Ewing unusual power.

Here is one from the New York State Pharmaceutical Association. They say they have a membership of 6,328 repre-

senting 94 percent of the druggists in New York, and they come out and oppose any part except the refilling of drugs. I mentioned the refilling of prescriptions. I mentioned that to my colleagues here because I want you to know that the druggists are for the refilling part but most of them are definitely opposed to giving Oscar Ewing the power to determine what drugs shall be sold, where, and under what conditions.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. And the capricious use of any such power would create a chaotic condition in the retail druggist business, would it not?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Definitely, yes. As I have said, I think there is going to be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota which will take out paragraph (b), and in lieu thereof insert the following language, which I have previously stated:

(b) because of its toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effects or the method of its use or the collateral measures necessary to its use is not safe for use except by or under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs.

Now, this amendment, I understand, has been devised to give the doctor or the druggist the type of a bill that, so far as I can ascertain, will be satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. To illustrate the confused situation that exists with respect to this provision giving the Administrator this wide authority, there is this to say: The American Medical Association is opposed to it. The American Pharmaceutical Association, which is composed of the pharmacists who work in drugstores, and the American Drug Manufacturers who manufacture drugs, are opposed to it. The American Association of Druggists is for it, though many of its members are opposed to it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is my understanding that the rank and file of druggists are satisfied with the refill section.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. But here are the people who deal with this problem from day to day intimately, the doctor, the druggist, the pharmacist, and the manufacturer. They cannot agree; in fact, most of them agree that delegation of this authority would be most unwise, and they are fearful as to how it would be exercised. I think that certainly is an unfortunate atmosphere for a bill to be presented to this House when the very people it affects cannot agree among themselves as to just what it will do.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is the gentleman positive that the American Medical Association as an association has defi-

nately stated that it is opposed to this bill rather than the legislative committee of the American Medical Association?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, all of these associations are speaking through their representatives.

Mr. BECKWORTH. But has the association gone on record saying it opposes this bill as an association, or was it the committee?

Mr. BENNETT. Their legislative representatives said they were opposed to it. The Retail Druggist did not come before our committee. He was represented by a spokesman here in Washington.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It has been the impression of a good many of us that the American Medical Association actually has not taken a very definite and specific position on it, and to evidence that fact the committee wanted the doctors to come before the committee, urged and requested them to, but they never did do it at all. That is the strange thing.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not expect to ask for a roll call upon the rule because I firmly believe that after debate this body will eliminate paragraph B, thus having a bill that will be satisfactory to the druggists, to the doctors, to the pharmacists, to the manufacturers, to the wholesalers, to the law enforcement officials, and above all to the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when the proponents of this legislation appeared before the Committee on Rules that committee desired to know how the committee stood in reporting the bill. We were informed then that only 4 of the 25 members were opposed to it and that after many weeks of consideration and investigation and hearings 19 of the members agreed to report this legislation.

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] implies that Mr. Ewing, Administrator of the Social Security Agency will administer the act. He is at the head of this agency, but will not actually enforce this law or provide the rules and regulations. The administration of the act will be under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration which has functioned for many, many years in enforcing food and drug laws.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows I am right on this. Please do not take up time on that point.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is in error on that point. Under the law, let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes; he will be the nominal head of it.

Mr. O'HARA. He is the Administrator under the bill.

Mr. SABATH. I know that, but he will not provide the rules and regulations that are necessary and that will

be submitted to him by the Food and Drug Administration for signature, personnel who are very familiar with this type of legislation and who have been protecting the lives of American citizens for many years.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I am endeavoring to find out some information as to why the need and necessity for this particular section, because the Food and Drug Administrator has authority at the present time to confiscate and take off the market deleterious or dangerous drugs, under existing law. Also the Federal Trade Commission has authority to stop the advertising, sale, labeling, and branding of drugs that are dangerous. So why the necessity for this additional legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There is a definite need for this legislation. I am sure it will be admitted by the gentlemen on the other side who oppose this particular provision, for the reason that there is and has been for some time increasing confusion under the present provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as to which drugs can be legally and lawfully and properly sold over the counter and which drugs should be restricted solely to the prescription of a physician.

Mr. EVINS. I think that is a point on which some decision should be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This is for the purpose of making that determination.

Mr. SABATH. I recollect that many years ago Dr. Wiley advocated food and drug legislation to protect the American public. Gentlemen then opposed the regulations he advocated. I am surprised that some of you gentlemen are not informed or are being led astray by the manufacturers. This is legislation proposed to protect the American people. The druggists surely should be and are entitled to some protection and a better Government-regulated method in dispensing drugs to the public. There are not any finer type of businessmen serving the needs of the people of our country than the druggists and we should heed their request for this legislation. Of course, there are some doctors that may object to this legislation because it will not be necessary for a patient to go to the doctor every time a prescription has to be refilled, because many of those prescriptions can be refilled without any danger to the patients.

But of course some of the doctors will be deprived of an additional \$5 or \$3 or an additional \$10 in the larger cities. We ought to take into consideration that when an important committee, like the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, devotes weeks and months to the consideration of legislation, it in turn is entitled to consideration. I feel this legislation is in the right direction and in the interest of the public. I have received several hundred telegrams from druggists from every section of the

United States which have come to me as chairman of the Committee on Rules urging and pleading to be relieved of the uncertainty that exists today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to encumber the RECORD by inserting many of the telegrams I have received, but I shall take the liberty of inserting a telegram that I received from my home city, Chicago, Ill., signed by Mr. John M. Meyers, executive secretary of the Chicago Retail Druggists' Association, and a telegram signed by Thomas J. Vratny, secretary of the Illinois Pharmaceutical Association, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., July 18, 1951.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of the Chicago Retail Druggists Association which represents the retail drug stores owners of metropolitan Chicago, embracing the counties of Cook, Lake, Kane, Du Page, and Will, at a regularly assembled quarterly meeting held July 17, 1951, directed the undersigned to advise you of their immediate concern and interest in the favorable passage of H. R. 3298, the so-called Durham-Humphrey bill now pending before the Rules Committee. This measure seeks to amend the present Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act so as to enable the retail druggists of the country to serve to public with medicaments more efficiently and more economically. In the interest of the public health the undersigned respectfully requests that you make possible the immediate consideration of this measure by the entire House membership.

JOHN M. MYERS,
Executive Secretary, Chicago Retail
Druggists' Association.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 23, 1951.

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The pharmacists of the State of Illinois especially the Seventh Congressional District beg of you to give consideration to granting a ruling for H. R. 3298 that it may get to the floor of the House for action.

THOMAS J. VRATNY,
Secretary, Illinois Pharmaceutical
Association.

Consequently I feel, and even though the gentlemen on the other side, and some on this side, agree that the rule should be granted, that any Member should have the right to offer amendments to the bill as provided in the rule.

This is an open rule. If any gentleman feels that he in his wisdom can improve the bill and safeguard the interest of the people, all well and good. Let us take that up in committee when the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, while I have the honor of membership on this great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I also have membership on another committee of the House, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Unfortunately for me, there was a conflict in the schedules of work of those two committees at the time this bill was under consideration. I was able to attend very few of the hearings and only a part of the consideration in execu-

tive session. But I attended enough of them to know that this is one of the most complicated pieces of legislation that has ever been presented to a committee of this House and ultimately to the House itself.

It is not as simple as it might appear on the surface, or as some people who have spoken would make it appear. It is exceedingly complicated, and its importance can also be judged by the amount of interest that has been displayed in it by the various professional and trade associations throughout the country.

Just to take the opposite viewpoint from some of my colleagues on the left at the moment, I point out that while it is possible such things as aspirin and Hadacol may come within the terms of this bill, there are some very important drugs which indeed should come under it. I might point out the antibiotics, such as aureomycin, streptomycin, and triptomycin, and all of such things. Somebody should be able to determine and have authority to determine whether or not those drugs are deleterious if sold under a freely refillable prescription and whether or not prescriptions should be refilled only on doctors' orders. I am not too concerned about those harmless drugs that we have known for a long, long time; but I am concerned about some of these new and border-line cases.

This has been a subject that has been very difficult to consider in the committee. The vote to report the bill to the floor was 19 to 4. The committee itself, even among the 19 and among the 4, are not so certain that they are right. This is not an easy subject, and I beg of you in the course of this discussion for as many as possible to remain on the floor and hear the truth spoken as our various committee members see it. Let us get away from the baloney and let us stick to the truth. This is too important for us to mess around with a lot of fancy statements that do not have real substance. This is important to the health and welfare of the people of the United States as a bill relating to the administration of the Food and Drug Act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3298) to amend section 503 (B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3298, with Mr. COLMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate will continue not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally di-

vided between the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is recognized.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be an expert on some of the details of this legislation, but I do feel that I understand what the committee has sought to do.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is the son of a druggist and who has had considerable drug experience, I understand, reported the bill and has undertaken to study it in detail and should be in a position to shed more light on the subject than probably any other member of the committee. I do know Representative WILLIAMS has studied the details of this legislation very carefully.

In the first place, I want it understood that Mr. Oscar Ewing did not compel this committee to do what it did. I know he did not compel me to take the position I have taken. I know he did not compel the author of the bill [Mr. DURHAM] to take the position he has taken. I know he did not compel the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is the son of a druggist and knows about these matters in detail, to take the position he has taken. I know he has not compelled our colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to take the position he has taken. I know that is true of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE], the State from which Mr. DURHAM comes. This same fact is true, I feel, concerning all the supporters of this bill.

I repeat, whether you like Mr. Ewing or whether you do not like him, he did not compel 19 members of this committee to vote for the provisions of this bill as it comes before the Committee of the Whole today.

The real reason why this committee is interested in doing something about this particular problem is because the preponderance of evidence we had over several days of hearings illustrated the fact that there is great confusion on the part of druggists and pharmacists who are selling drugs. They are in a dilemma.

To give some specific situations, our report contains some of them. I might say that in the past 3 weeks I have written many druggists in Texas and have received many replies. The letters I have received give practically unanimous approval of the provisions of the Durham bill. Almost without exception the letters have read like this:

We have not known whether or not we were violating the laws as we have dispensed certain drugs.

There is a very good reason for that, because individual manufacturers themselves have been, in effect, calling the shots. It is no reflection on the various manufacturers that they would have varying opinions about certain drugs.

This is what troubles the druggist. Please note the report.

On page 5 we have this statement, for example:

A sample of precipitated chalk manufactured by one manufacturer was labeled with this legend—

That is what was on the package for the druggist to go by—

"Caution: To be dispensed only by or on prescription of a physician, dentist, or veterinarian, or otherwise used only for manufacturing purposes. This restriction applies only to medicinal uses."

Another sample of the same drug manufactured by a different manufacturer carried the following directions for use:

Average dose, one-quarter teaspoon in water. May also be used as a tooth powder.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Not at this point.

What the druggist is confused by is the same product put out by different manufacturers with different instructions as to its use. Why would not that kind of thing confuse anybody who wants to do the right thing? The druggists have indicated over, and over, and over again that that is the kind of thing they are seeking to clear up and for that reason are anxious for this legislation.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has talked about precipitated chalk. The gentleman knows it is a perfectly harmless compound that is sold at drug stores; does he not? It does not have any evil effects at all.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not pretend to be much of an expert even on precipitated chalk. The thing I am trying to point out is that the same commodity sold to druggists by different firms bears different legends.

Mr. O'HARA. On that point will the gentleman recognize the testimony that was in the record that some drug manufacturers sell to the druggists for over-the-counter sale; some of them sell to druggists for resale by prescription; they do not want to manufacture or sell except to druggists and physicians. Is not that true?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I think I get the gentleman's point. One of the things this bill proposes to do is to distinguish between over-the-counter drugs and prescription drugs, to make it very, very plain which is which; and why is not that a good thing? Why would not any person who is endeavoring to operate a drugstore on a legitimate basis desire to have definite information as to which is which? After all, a drug for sale over the counter is a drug that presumably is to be used for self-medication, and if one is to use it, the druggist should have the assurance that as he sells that drug over the counter he is not going to do injury to the person who buys it or be prosecuted for the sale. On the other hand, if a drug is of such a serious composition that it must be prescribed, the druggist should have definite information that it should be prescribed in order

that he may know he is not making a mistake in connection with that kind of drug. What I have just said, of course, applies in the main to drugs all of the characteristics of which druggists cannot be familiar with. They may be new drugs.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The Federal Security Administrator has authority under present law to proceed against one or the other of the manufacturers in the case the gentleman just referred to, proceed for mislabeling; in other words, if the same drug has different labels one package is mislabeled and the Administrator has ample authority today to proceed. But he does not proceed in the cases the gentleman mentioned because there is no harm being done.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right, and I think that is a good example of the fairness that has characterized the Federal Administrator covering the Durham bill. If he were proceeding there would be many, many proceedings at this time; and there are examples of such confusion that were presented to our committee where serious and earnest pleas were made that we help straighten out such confusion.

The gentleman is correct, the Administrator could proceed, but it is because of the multitude of proceedings that would have to be instituted almost right now that we are undertaking to help straighten out this problem.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. He does not proceed in this case because no harm is being done. After all, in the case of a harmless drug, if the drug manufacturer does put a prescription label on it, who is harmed?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The record evidences cases where druggists were innocently going ahead and selling what they thought was not illegal, and yet would have to undergo proceedings because of certain decisions or opinions that they were not aware of at the time or perhaps had not been made at the time of their sale or sales. That is exactly true, and it is that kind of thing we are trying to straighten out; it is what the druggists want straightened out.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. In straightening it out, the fear that many people have is that the cure might be worse than the disease.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That theory is entertained by some, but I do not subscribe to it after listening to all of the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill, other than the section that has been discussed so much under which Mr. Ewing would have the power to place certain drugs in certain categories if the facts warrant, does some other things as those of you who are familiar with it or who have studied it already are aware. It would permit the drugs to be prescribed over the telephone. Today that is not regarded as legal. Then it would permit certain refilling of prescriptions

if those prescriptions do not fall in the three prohibited categories, refilling without another prescription. As the situation exists today, a prescription presumably cannot be refilled unless on the prescription the doctor says that it can be refilled.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I think the gentleman is making a very fine statement. I would like to go back to a question that was asked by the gentleman from Michigan. Is it not true that, under the present situation, the first the druggist knows that he is in violation of the law is when he is greeted with a warrant from some Federal officer or subjected to libel proceedings and seizure of his business and the destruction of his business? Is that not true under the present system, which is what we are trying to prevent by this legislation?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is precisely the case.

There has been a good deal of talk about who is for this bill and who is against the bill. I think it is accurate to say that the drug manufacturers in general, that is, those who are manufacturing drugs, are opposed to the bill.

With reference to the other two categories there is considerable difference of opinion as to just what the situation is. I think it is fair to say that about 34,000 druggists who belong to the Druggists' Association or the association that has in it people who own drugstores and who are pharmacists, do favor this bill. Perhaps the other organization having some 14,000 pharmacists may be opposed to the bill. Certainly some of them are. But the thing that impressed this subcommittee was the fact that the great body of druggists, those who are in the position primarily of selling drugs, and I would say a heavy percentage of all drugs, to the American people simply want to know where they stand with reference to various drugs.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. As a result of this legislation will there be a tightening up or a relaxation of the possibility of buying drugs by the consumer?

Mr. BECKWORTH. May I say this, in my opinion the Pure Food and Drug people of this country, who want to do a fair and reasonable job by the American people, incidentally, are for this bill. You know, a lot is said about the Federal Security Administrator, but the Pure Food and Drug people are for this legislation too. If they are against any part of it, I do not know what it is, and we have some mighty able and conscientious people down there.

In answer to the gentleman, may I say that the one item needed is certainty—certainty as to the category in which a drug should be placed, will be the product of this legislation, not necessarily a tightening up, not necessarily a loosening, but a certainty with reference to various drugs. The Pure Food and Drug people will do what they have sought to

do in the past, and that is to place drugs in the category that they should be, and in such a manner that the American consuming public of drugs will be protected. That is their objective, in my opinion.

Mr. EVINS. In other words, it is the gentleman's view that there are many items in which the consumer has to get a prescription at the present time before he can acquire it, whereas later it may not be necessary to have that prescription.

Mr. BECKWORTH. In reference to an innocuous drug, the Pure Food and Drug people, through Mr. Oscar Ewing, because he happens to be the head of the agency under which the Pure Food and Drug agency operates, probably will be placed in a category where a druggist can sell it over the counter and sell it safely without fear of prosecution.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, my very good friend and colleague has raised one important point. I am wondering whether or not the druggist in his district, in his State, and throughout the Nation, really know the contents of the bill. In the time that will be allotted to me I want to illustrate to the committee and to the Members of this House a situation that actually exists. In fact, they have not even read the bill. Someone from their association asked them to write us, to wire us, to contact us to support this bill. Now then, I sent out copies of the bill and I sent copies of the minority report to them and asked them to please study it, and in all of those cases they wrote to me, "Do not give any more authority to the Administrator not only on refills, but let us fight one part and support the other part."

Mr. BECKWORTH. In the first place, that question could be asked with reference to any bill which the House of Representatives considers. There always is a question as to how much the citizens of this country know about the details of given bills which we consider here. I had the same experience as the gentleman. I try to be as cautious and careful as the gentleman, so I sent out many of these bills to druggists in Texas, and I just want to say to the gentleman that the responses which I received do not correspond to the responses of the people to whom he refers. I am not doubting the gentleman, but I am just saying that the response I received from druggists in our section, in the Southwest, in Texas primarily, just do not correspond with what the gentleman says he received. Very frequently the people of different sections of our country see legislation differently, but I am convinced by and large that the druggists throughout this country know in the main what this bill is, and they are for it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say that I have listened very carefully to the

gentleman's exposition of this bill, and I also read the report and some of the hearings very carefully. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement before the committee this afternoon. I want to say this, if there is one field outside of the field of food regulation, where the American public has been milked out of millions and millions of dollars, it is by the patent-medicine manufacturers of the United States.

It is about time, it seems to me, that we take recognition of this fact and give some sort of protection to the people of the United States and also some sort of protection to those who are customarily called upon to sell these drugs. Looking over this bill, I think there is a great deal of merit to it. I appreciate the exposition the gentleman has given of its contents.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We did not have a lot of testimony with reference to such products as patent medicines and those remedies sold by companies like the Watkins Co. and the Rawleigh Co., companies whose personnel in my area I appreciate, but in my opinion they would be affected in no way except as they come within the scope of these three categories; habit-forming drugs, dangerous drugs, and new drugs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Certainly the public should be given some protection from those types.

Mr. BECKWORTH. If they meet the standards that are set up to protect the public, I think that kind of people need have no fear.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that this legislation is designed and has for its purpose only one thing, that is, to protect sick people and provide for them the type and kind of product that they should have for their health and safety?

Mr. BECKWORTH. There is no question about that. That was the only thing that motivated the 19 members of the committee for this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, so that he may yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. A little while ago in the debate the gentleman from Texas asked me a question as to whether the action of the legislative committee of the American Medical Association in opposing this bill was approved by the association itself. I am glad to advise him that I have been informed by Mr. Wilson of the legislative committee that the board of trustees of the American Medical Association approved the action taken by the legislative committee.

Mr. BECKWORTH. On what date?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. He does not say on what date.

Mr. BECKWORTH. My colleague knows I have the greatest respect for him, but the American Medical Association should know that to be most effective it should make its position known to the committee before the committee acts and, if possible, come before the committee and state its position, because our committee is one that will give consideration to the opinion and position of the American Medical Association just as it will to that of anybody else's group. Since the gentleman has brought up the position of the American Medical Association—

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman from Texas asked me the question as to whether the board of trustees of the American Medical Association had approved the action. I gave him the answer.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am truly interested in getting information. May I ask the gentleman to place in the RECORD at this point the position of the American Medical Association as they stated it and the date they passed on it? I think it would be of interest to have it in the RECORD, because so far we do not have it.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I will refer to it in my remarks.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLMER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3298) to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTROL OF EXPORTS

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 363, Rept. No. 777), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4550) to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes. That, after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommmit.

COMMISSION TO STUDY ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Federal Commission similar to the Hoover Commission on the revision of the antitrust laws. This bill is being introduced in the other body by the junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE.

Fundamental changes have taken place in our own economy and in the economy of the world since the antitrust laws were enacted in 1890, making a specific review vital today. The problem of gearing our vast industrial machine to the demands of world leadership both in defense and civilian production require new rules. In addition, the relationship of the United States to foreign economic systems needs redefinition in terms of what will contribute most effectively to the defense of the free world and to its maximum integrated production effort.

There has been much complaint in recent years that antitrust policies have crippled small business, particularly in its trade-association activities and in its efforts to pool resources to achieve a better competitive position, denied consumers the benefits of integration, hampered the cooperation of business in the defense effort, and sought to change drastically the geographical pattern of commerce. On the other hand, it has been charged that big business, due to policies in the last two decades, has just grown bigger, that price leadership has become price uniformity, and that the monopolistic privileges of patents are being grossly abused.

We are convinced that our system of the free economy of which the major regulatory statutes are the antitrust laws can be refreshed and revitalized through a review of the antitrust laws in the light of the problems which have been disclosed and the methods of their solution which the courts have adopted. It is time to bring the antitrust laws back to the Congress and the people who alone should determine the Nation's economic destiny. Whether the varying economic interests of the country are right or wrong about what has occurred in antitrust law decision and administration, the review will be healthy and changes can be made in the light of the new stature of the United States on the world horizon.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Whereas there exist under the antitrust statutes of the United States conflicts in policy as to the proper standards of conduct required to be observed by American industry; and

Whereas interpretation and administration of the said laws by the several courts and administrative agencies have not succeeded in resolving said conflicts; and

Whereas such conflicts and duplication of responsibility among enforcement agencies have resulted in unnecessary expense and burden on the Federal Government and on business;

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the economy of the

United States, to increase the efficiency of American business and industry, to improve quality, reduce price and increase output and real wages, and to promote the free flow of goods and services to the American people by (1) strengthening the laws prohibiting monopoly and unreasonable restraints on trade and commerce; (2) clarifying standards of conduct deemed lawful under the antitrust laws; (3) adjusting the policies of the Federal Government toward business, industry, investors, agriculture, and labor to conform with the present-day needs of the American people; (4) eliminating conflicts in policy and inconsistencies in the said antitrust laws as interpreted by the courts and administrative agencies; (5) relieving industry of responsibility under said laws for conduct performed at the request of duly constituted United States Government authorities; (6) revising Federal antitrust laws, the effect of which is to impair initiative and the development of new enterprises; (7) coordinating the activities of the Government in relation to the administration and enforcement of the antitrust laws; and (8) improving the methods and procedures of administration and enforcement of such laws.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policies set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives—two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Political affiliation: Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Vacancies: Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. The Chairman shall be a Member of Congress.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress, who are members of the Commission, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary \$15,000; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other

necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 10 (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Investigation: The Commission for the purpose of recommending to the Congress measures required under and amendments to the antitrust laws to accomplish the policy declared in section 1 of this act, and other measures deemed by the Commission necessary or appropriate thereto shall study and investigate and shall hear evidence with a view toward determining, but without limitation (1) the effect of the existing price systems and pricing policies of business and industry upon the general level of trade, employment, profits, production and consumption; (2) the effect and operation of existing antitrust statutes as interpreted by and administered under judicial decisions and administrative regulations, decisions and orders, upon competition, price levels, employment, profits, production and consumption; (3) the extent and causes of concentration of economic power and financial control and their effect on competition.

(b) Report: Within 6 months the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) Hearings and sessions. The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places and take such testimony as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member. The Commission shall have such powers of subpoena and compulsion of attendance and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the act of August 26, 1935, and the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpoena or otherwise to attend and testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Commission, except that no subpoena shall be issued except under the signature of the Chairman, and application to any court for aid in enforcing such subpoena may be made only by said Chairman. Subpoenas shall be served by any person designated by the said Chairman.

(b) Obtain official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, information, sug-

gestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. BATES of Kentucky submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4329) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HELLER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PRIEST and to include a comparison on the savings of the graduated-leave plan as compared to the so-called Douglas-amendment plan.

Mr. HEBERT and to include an address.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN.

Mr. CLEVENGER in three instances and to include excerpts from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. NICHOLSON and to include an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include an editorial.

Mr. FELLOWS and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include an article by Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, following the first vote in the proceedings today.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER and Mr. HINSHAW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN in three instances.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to accompany same with appropriate material.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include a radio address and an editorial.

Mr. VELDE and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HARVEY and to include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include a letter entitled "Defense of the Dollar."

Mr. D'EWART and to include a news story.

Mr. SHAFER in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. CHELF, for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, on account of Kentucky primary elections.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

JULY 15, 1951.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee and profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey, the clerk	\$5,422.98
Kenneth Sprakle, the assistant clerk	5,422.98
William A. Duvall, second assistant clerk	5,242.50
Corhal D. Orescan, assistant clerk	5,242.50
Robert E. Lambert, assistant clerk	5,242.50
Arthur Orr, assistant clerk	4,896.90
Paul M. Wilson, assistant clerk	4,896.90
Ross P. Pope, assistant clerk	4,758.60
Robert P. Williams, assistant clerk	4,758.60
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr., assistant clerk	4,348.95
Jay B. Howe, assistant clerk	4,551.24
Adelbert W. Heimiller, assistant clerk	3,472.93
Frank Sanders, assistant clerk	4,148.03
Carson W. Culp, assistant clerk	3,294.35
Robert M. Moyer, assistant clerk	3,331.85
Lawrence C. Miller, junior assistant clerk	2,859.30
G. Homer Skarin, junior assistant clerk	2,569.62
Earl C. Sisby, junior assistant clerk	2,569.62
Melvin E. LeFever, clerk-stenographer	1,990.26
Robert W. Thompson, clerk-stenographer	1,658.55
Francis G. Merrill, clerk-stenographer	563.90
Robert M. Lewis, messenger	1,686.12
Frank B. Avery, Jr., page	259.29
Willie Tarrant, janitor-messenger	954.24
John C. Pugh, consultant	919.32
E. L. Eckloff, clerk to the majority	4,205.64
Robert E. Lee, clerk to the minority	5,422.98
Lawrence C. DiCenzo, clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member	1,990.26
Julia M. Elliott, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,990.26
Vivian V. Martin, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,990.26
Eula D. Rigby, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,990.26
Marion B. Lacey, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,360.01
Geneva Nichols, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,990.26
William J. Neary, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,990.26
Alice C. Keffe, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,326.84

Name of employee and profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Norajan Ray, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	\$1,990.26
Michael J. McGrath, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,990.26
Marie Silvers, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	995.13
Ethel C. Hester, clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	232.19
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$232,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	104,389.72
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1951	114,526.90
Total amount expended from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951	218,916.62
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1951	13,083.38

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1951.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee and profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederic D. Vechery, chief investigator	\$4,212.48
James J. Maloney, chief investigator (from Jan. 1 to 31)	712.46
James E. Nugent, investigator	3,577.24
Florence M. Leonard, clerk-stenographer	1,793.79
Lois A. Eggers, clerk-stenographer	1,305.12
Hazel N. Ward, clerk-stenographer	90.46
Anna R. Murabito, clerk-stenographer	562.04
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	
Department of Agriculture:	
John C. Cooper, investigator	1,731.42
William D. Strang, investigator	492.30
Hubert S. White, investigator	723.52
Civil Service Commission:	
George R. Boss, investigator	1,173.41
Bernard Rosen, investigator	701.42
Export-Import Bank of Washington: John D. Fitch, investigator	1,607.71
Federal Bureau of Investigation:	
Marshall J. Bell, investigator	1,582.36
Charles G. Haynes, investigator	1,466.96
James J. Maloney, investigator	838.80
Adrian L. Meyer, investigator	1,266.64
James E. Nugent, investigator	474.16
Robert E. Rightmeyer, investigator	2,078.36
Federal Security Agency:	
G. Richard Clague, investigator	1,286.04
C. Erwin Rice, investigator	427.49
Department of the Interior:	
Arnold O. Babb, investigator	70.76
Don S. Campbell, investigator	1,446.20
Wilbur A. Drexler, investigator	1,653.90
Herschel F. Jones, investigator	846.15
Robert H. Officer, investigator	1,715.39
Milton S. Sachs, investigator	634.63
Interstate Commerce Commission: Alexis P. Bukovsky, investigator	1,618.05
Department of Labor:	
Max D. Kossoris, investigator	565.76
David Schenker, investigator	889.44
The Panama Canal:	
Edwin M. McGinnis, investigator	1,592.72
Nelson E. Wise, investigator	101.10
Securities and Exchange Commission: James A. Swink, investigator	1,286.16

XCVII—582

Name of employee and profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—continued	
Tennessee Valley Authority: James E. Goddard, investigator	\$1,050.20
Treasury Department:	
Alonzo J. Covel, investigator	1,993.88
T. Jack Gary, Jr., investigator	1,774.05
W. Harold Lane, investigator	2,389.78
Wilbur H. Ziehl, investigator	2,032.00
Veterans Administration:	
Stephen J. Grillo, investigator	522.00
Joe M. Hansman, investigator	535.37
Department of Justice:	
John J. Donnelly, Jr., counsel	1,456.42
Roy E. Curtis, economist	526.02
Bernard A. Friedman, assistant counsel	197.66
Hubert Peters, assistant counsel	437.08
Department of Agriculture: William Burke, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	727.00
Atomic Energy Commission: Isabel G. Belt, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	232.14
Department of Commerce:	
Earle F. Allen, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	661.85
Joseph R. Melvin, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	438.38
Economic Cooperation Administration:	
Dorothy T. Scheele, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	201.27
Esther M. Robbins, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	24.00
General Services Administration: John C. Aukward, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	583.44
Department of the Interior: Francis M. Wiles, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	583.84
Department of Justice:	
Mary E. McGovern, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	453.18
Kathryn B. Morris, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	16.24
Department of Labor:	
Izabell R. Craig, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	652.16
Robert P. VanZant, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	1,326.90
Post Office Department: Francis G. Merrill, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	586.68
Public Housing Administration: Robert L. Michaels, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	2,511.56
Department of State: Delbert D. McHaffy, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	1,150.86
Department of the Treasury: Reese V. Bean, temporary clerical and editorial assistant	911.54
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$185,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	96,083.15
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1951	82,695.30
Total amount expended from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951	183,042.07
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1951	1,957.93

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

662. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$273,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

663. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$3,050,000 for the General Services Administration (H. Doc. No. 211); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

664. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, transmitting the report of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, pursuant to section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam (Public Law 30, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) (H. Doc. No. 212); to the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

665. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake the North Fork Kings River development, California, as an integral part of the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

666. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Tenth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, as required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

667. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting compilation of preliminary examination, survey, and review reports on river and harbor and flood-control improvements, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 214); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

668. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Public Law 520, 79th Cong.), for the period January 1 to June 30, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

669. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, relative to the preparation of a study of the assistance to the United States maritime industry which is provided through special tax provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and the various revenue acts (H. Doc. No. 213); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to provide housing relief in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood disaster emergency; with amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 363. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4550, a bill to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee of Conference. H. R. 4329. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 778). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 5010. A bill to provide certain service-connected disability benefits to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5011. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations in any branch of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 5012. A bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 5013. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5014. A bill to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and compensation by reason of their evacuation from military areas during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5015. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the performance of an agreement with the Republic of Panama regarding the relocation of the terminal facilities of the Panama Railroad in the city of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 362. A resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the disappearance of the report, relating to the Katyn massacre, dictated by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., on May 22, 1945; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5016. A bill for the relief of Fred Deckwitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5017. A bill for the relief of Jose dos Barros Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5018. A bill for the relief of Antonio Felope Moises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 5019. A bill for the relief of Stavruia Perutsea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

371. Mr. FELLOWS presented a resolution by Maine Federation of Women's Clubs at Poland Springs, Maine, relative to wise exercise of freedom, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1951

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we would lift our gaze from the valley of the daily round to the far horizon of our fairest dreams, from the tyranny of drab details to the glory of the heavenly vision, to which we

dare not be disobedient. Pressed by the practical problems which crowd our hours and which cry for solution, we would keep clear in our vision and faith the eternal things amid the tempests of the temporal.

Teach us the secret of dwelling in a world full of hate and, yet, not becoming hateful persons. Giving our best ability to the peoples' good, may we rise above life's bitterness by an unshakable belief in the shining splendor of humanity. We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 30, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 30, 1951:

S. 259. An act to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 261. An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1950;

S. 488. An act to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia;

S. 490. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia";

S. 494. An act to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 573. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes.

On July 31, 1951:

S. 262. An act to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes; and

S. 1717. An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4329) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BATES of Kentucky, Mr. YATES, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. WILSON of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 629) to au-

thorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.

The message also further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4484. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to provide housing relief in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood disaster emergency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 629) to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont., and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4484. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Labor and Labor-Management Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, and transact routine business, without debate, and that the time occupied in doing so not be charged to either side in connection with the business for today, Senate bill 719.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ASSISTANCE TO UNITED STATES MARITIME INDUSTRY

A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on a study of